



R. E. MILNER





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

880
D676m
vol. 2
stacks

A
HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE
OF
ANCIENT GREECE;

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS TO THE
TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE TURKS.

BEING
A CONTINUATION OF K. O. MÜLLER'S WORK.

BY
JOHN WILLIAM DONALDSON, D.D.,
CLASSICAL EXAMINER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON;
AND LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.



IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. II.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.
1858.

[The Author reserves the right of Translation.]

CONCORDIA LIBRARY
NEW YORK

19.741

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME

THIRD PERIOD—(CONTINUED).

CHAPTER XLVII.

SCHOOLS OF PHILOSOPHY.

	PAGE
§ 1. State of Athens in regard to literature and philosophy after the death of Aristotle	1
2. Development of the different schools of philosophy	4
3. The old Academy: Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemon, Crantor, and Crates	6
4. The Peripatetics: Theophrastus, Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, and Strato	9
5. The Sceptics: Pyrrhon and Timon	14
6. The Epicureans	17
7. The Stoics: Zeno, Ariston, Herillus, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Panætius, and Poseidonius	21
8. The middle and new Academy: Arcesilaus, Carneades, Cleitomachus, Philo, Antiochus	37

CHAPTER XLVIII.

CULTIVATION OF THE THEORY OF RHETORIC.

§ 1. Rapid decline of Greek oratory. Demetrius, the Phalerian, and Cineas	46
2. Oratory becomes scholastic	49
3. Rhodian and Asiatic schools	52
4. Rhetorical theories	55

CHAPTER XLIX.

TREATMENT OF HISTORY.—POLYBIUS AND HIS IMMEDIATE PREDECESSORS.

§ 1. Life of Timæus	60
2. Character of his history, and its relations to that of Polybius	62
3. Other forerunners of Polybius	68
4. Political career of Polybius	71
5. Analysis of his history	76
6. His style and characteristics	81

CHAPTER L.

GREEK LITERATURE DOMESTICATED AT ROME.

	PAGE
§ 1. Native literature of Italy	87
2. Cultivation of Greek literature at Rome	91
3. Influence of Greek poetry	93
4. Greek rhetoric	98
5. Greek philosophy	105

CHAPTER LI.

LEARNED HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY UNDER THE CÆSARS.

§ 1. Historians whose works are lost: Castor, Theophanes, Timagenes, Juba, Nicolaus, and Poseidonius	109
2. The Universal History of Diodorus	115
3. The Roman Archæology of Dionysius	121
4. The Jewish Archæology of Josephus	125
4. The continuation of Polybius by Strabo. His general geography based on that of Eratosthenes	131

CHAPTER LII.

NEW FLIGHT OF RHETORIC IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

§ 1. Formal establishment of the sophistical rhetoric in the second century. The school of Athens	141
2. Dion Chrysostomus	146
3. Herodes Atticus	148
4. Favorinus of Arles and Maximus of Tyre	151
5. Ælius Aristeides	153
6. Hermogenes of Tarsus, and Hadrian of Tyre	156
7. The Philostrati	159
8. Grammarians	164

CHAPTER LIII.

ORIENTAL TENDENCIES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY.—NEO-PLATONISM.

§ 1. Growth of Oriental ideas among the Greeks	166
2. Philo the Jew	172
3. Plutarch	178
4. Numenius and Cronius	182
5. Ammonius Saccas and Hermes Trismegistus	184
6. Plotinus	187
7. Amelius, Porphyrius, and Iamblichus	196

CHAPTER LIV.

THE OPPOSITE TENDENCY.—LUCIAN.

	PAGE
§ 1. Opposition to Oriental enthusiasm	205
2. Stoicism in its relations to Neo-Platonism. Arrian's <i>Epicetetus</i> and M. Aurelius	207
3. Lucian: an opponent of Oriental superstitions and impostures	214
4. His works	220
5. Longinus: a seceder from the Neo-Platonic school	230
6. His merits as a critic, and the causes of his general celebrity	233

CHAPTER LV.

HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY UNDER THE ANTONINES AND
THEIR SUCCESSORS.

§ 1. Plutarch's historical works	237
2. Arrian's <i>Anabasis</i> and <i>Indica</i>	244
3. Appian's <i>Roman History</i> arranged according to the different Countries .	247
4. Dion Cassius: his <i>History of Rome</i>	250
5. Herodian's <i>History of the Successors of the Antonines</i>	253
6. Philo of Byblus, and his <i>Phœnician Records</i>	255
7. Pausanias the tourist	258

CHAPTER LVI.

SCIENTIFIC SCHOLARS AND LEARNED COLLECTORS.

§ 1. (a) Scientific expositors: Claudius Ptolemæus, the systematic astronomer and geographer	263
2. Claudius Galenus, the reviver of Hippocratic medicine	270
3. Sextus Empiricus, the commentator on philosophical systems; and Diogenes of Laërte, the biographer of the philosophers	275
4. (b) Tacticians: Onosander and Polyænus	280
5. (c) Literary collectors: Julius Africanus	282
6. Ælian of Præneste	283
7. Athenæus of Naucratis	284

CHAPTER LVII.

LAST DAYS OF PAGANISM.—HEATHEN RHETORICIANS AND
PHILOSOPHERS.

§ 1. Last days of Heathendom; rhetoricians and philosophers of the old school	288
2. Ulpianus of Emesa and Antioch	290
3. Themistius	291
4. Libanius	294
5. Himerius	298
6. The Emperor Julian	299
7. Proclus. The end of heathen philosophy	308

CHAPTER LVIII.

ANTAGONISM OF CHRISTIANITY.—OPPONENTS OF HEATHEN
LITERATURE.

	PAGE
§ 1. Gradual development of the antagonism between classical and Christian literature, and causes of the growing alienation	314
2. Classical tendencies of the earliest Christians. Justin Martyr	316
3. Clement of Alexandria. Hippolytus and Origen	318
4. The antagonism becomes pronounced, when Christianity is adopted as the State religion. Eusebius of Cæsarea	328
5. Christian sophists. Prohæresius	335
6. Gregory of Nazianzus and his brother Cæsarius	336
7. Basil and his brother Gregory of Nyssa	339
8. John Chrysostom	341
9. Nemeseus of Emesa and Synesius of Cyrene	344
10. Cyril of Alexandria	346

CHAPTER LIX.

ECHOES OF THE OLD LITERATURE.—ROMANCES.—THE EPIC
SCHOOL OF NONNUS.

§ 1. Echoes of the old classical spirit grow fainter after the commencement of the fifth century	348
2. Mathematicians at Alexandria: Cleomedes, Diophantus, Pappus, Theon, and Hypatia	349
3. Cosmas the geographer	352
4. Romances as substitutes for poetry: Heliodorus	353
5. Achilles Tatius	356
6. Longus	357
7. Chariton and Emathius	360
8. Fictitious letters. Alciphron and Aristænetus	361
9. The mythographic epos: Nonnus	363
10. Quintus Smyrnæus	365
11. Coluthus and Tryphiodorus	366
12. Musæus	369

CHAPTER LX.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CULTIVATION OF LITERATURE AT
BYZANTIUM.

§ 1. Historical sketch of Byzantine literature, from Justinian to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks	372
2. Classification of the literary productions of this period	378
3. Learned Collectors	379
4. Lexicographers	383
5. Grammarians and commentators	388

CONTENTS.

vii

	PAGE
§ 6. Sophists	389
7. Poets	391
8. First class of Byzantine historians, or writers of Byzantine annals . . .	394
9. Second class, or chroniclers	396
10. Third class, or biographers	398
11. Fourth class, or antiquarians	400
12. Ecclesiastical historians	402
13. Physiologists and physicians	404
14. General retrospect of Greek literature	405

ERRATA.

Page 95, line 11, for 'JULIUS' read 'and JULIUS.'

Page 202, line 21, for '*Babylonica*' read '*Babyloniaca*.'

HISTORY

OF THE

LITERATURE OF ANCIENT GREECE.

THIRD PERIOD (CONTINUED).

CHAPTER XLVII.

SCHOOLS OF PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of Athens in regard to literature and philosophy after the death of Aristotle. § 2. Development of the different schools of philosophy. § 3. The old Academy: Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemon, Crantor, and Crates. § 4. The Peripatetics: Theophrastus, Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, and Strato. § 5. The Sceptics: Pyrrhon and Timon. § 6. The Epicureans. § 7. The Stoics: Zeno, Ariston, Herillus, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Panætius, and Poseidonius. § 8. The middle and new Academy: Arcesilaus, Carneades, Cleitomachus, Philo, Antiochus.

§ 1. **WE** must now return to Athens, which had been the chief seat and centre of Greek literature during the second or classical period of its development, but had now, in all respects but one, resigned the leadership to the city of the Ptolemies. While Alexandria was producing the series of learned poets, acute grammarians, polyglot scholars, and original discoverers in mathematics and inductive science, which we have discussed in the two preceding chapters, Athenian literature was represented only by a chronicler or two, by a transient activity of the comic muse, and by the successive or contemporaneous establishment of certain forms of mental and moral philosophy, founded on the various Socratic schools which have been already traced to their origin.¹ Before we examine sepa-

¹ See above, chapter XXXVII.

rately these feeble manifestations of the intellectual activity of Athens, it will be desirable to take a general view of the state of literature and society in that city.

The death of Aristotle was speedily followed by the unsuccessful issue of the Lamian war; and the degradation of Athens was completed when Demetrius Phalereus, who had governed the city as the literary and oratorical organ of the Macedonian powers, gave place to his namesake Poliorcetes, before whom the Athenians prostrated themselves with impiously servile adulation, and whose residence at Athens tended more than any other circumstance to debase the character of the people.¹ Political oratory became impossible. The historical labours of Philochorus resembled rather those of the Alexandrians than those of his countrymen in a former age.² New tragedies no longer appeared on the stage, which had been restored to the Homeric rhapsodists, the original representatives of the tragic dialogue.³ The only safe pursuit was that of pleasure, and literature was considered to have done all that was left to it, when it sought to combine some amount of intellectual refinement with the coarser gratifications of the senses. Its only available channels were the new comedy, which still kept its place on the stage, and the schools of philosophy, which echoed, in strangely altered accents, some traditions of the doctrines of Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. The chief ministers of the combination of intellectual refinement with social pleasure, which alone represented the sometime elegance (εὐτραπείλια) peculiar to Athens,⁴ were the courtesans, who studied philosophy and literature in order to enhance by the charms of their conversation the victory which their personal attractions had already gained over the neglected duties of domestic life.⁵ While theories of various kinds were propounded for the specu-

¹ See Athen. VI. p. 252 F, and foll. *Plut. Vit. Demetr.* cc. 24—27.

² *Comp.* chapter XLIII. § 6. *Chapter XLVI.* § 4.

³ Athen. XIV. p. 620 B: τοὺς δὲ νῦν Ὀμηριστὰς ὀνομαζομένους πρῶτος εἰς τὰ θέατρα παρήγαγε Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς.

⁴ *Thucyd.* II. 41: καὶ καθ' ἑκαστον δοκεῖν ἂν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλείστ' ἂν εἶδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ' ἂν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αὐταρκες παρέχσθαι.

⁵ See the remarks of H. Ritter, *Hist. of Anc. Philosophy*, vol. III. p. 381, Engl. Tr.

lative amusement of those who frequented the gardens in the neighbourhood of Athens, the comic stage presented in the most attractive colours the lax morality of the age, and exhibited in ingenious complications of incidents the love-stories, which were of common occurrence in the best circles at Athens, and of which the heroines, unfortunately, were not the well-born daughters of citizens, the legitimate objects of a lawful attachment, but the accomplished and beautiful *hetææ* for whom alone the young men of Athens felt any approximation to the passion of love.¹ Such comedies could have no attraction for those who were not accustomed by practical experience to the events represented on the stage, and it was with pungent truth that Antiphanes indicated this apprenticeship to Alexander the Great as the necessary condition for a due appreciation of his plays.² The courtesans, who were famous for their wit no less than for their beauty, were the chosen companions of the greatest comedians. Menander was devoted to Glycera,³ and Diphilus was notoriously submissive to the facetious Gnathæna.⁴ And while they thus influenced the public by means of the stage, they were careful to gain what accomplishment they could from the best intellectual refinement of the day: Nicarete even attended the subtle lectures of Stilpo,⁵ and Leontion⁶ and many others were pupils of Epicurus. It must indeed have been from a sense of the important effects which these comedians and courtesans had produced on the society of Athens, that learned writers, like Eratosthenes,⁷ Apollodorus,⁸ and Aristophanes of Byzantium,⁹ thought it worth their while to compose elaborate books on one or other of these subjects; and though these works are lost, modern writers have endeavoured

¹ The facts are sufficiently exhibited by Müller, above ch. XXIX. § 8; see also Guill. Guizot, *Ménandre; étude historique et littéraire sur la Comédie et la Société Grecques*, Paris, 1855, pp. 313 sqq.

² Athen. XIII. p. 555 A: δέῃ γάρ, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τὸν ταῦτα ἀποδεχόμενον ἀπὸ συμβόλων τε πολλάκις δεδειπνηκέναι καὶ περὶ ἑταίρας πλεονάκις καὶ εἰληφέναι καὶ δεδωκέναι πληγάς.

³ Athen. XIII. p. 594 D; 585 C.

⁴ *Id.* pp. 579 E, F; 580 A; 583 E, F.

⁵ She was also his concubine, Diog. Laërt. II. 114.

⁶ *Id.* X. 4, 23.

⁷ See above p. 510 [350].

⁸ See Athen. XIII. 46, p. 583 F; p. 591 C, et. al.

⁹ *Id.* p. 567, et alibi.

to give us some idea of the nature and effects of this alliance between the writers of the new comedy and the philosophizing *hetæra* of degraded Athens.¹

§ 2. Although the female sophists of the day attended the schools of philosophy, just as ambitious demagogues had sought the society of Socrates, for the purpose of increasing their ascendancy over the minds of those whom they wished to influence, we must consider this as a proof rather that there was a general demand for speculative inquiries, which found its way into the ordinary conversation of Athens, than that the philosophers were united with the writers of the new comedy in disparaging the rules of morality and in encouraging the social laxity of their countrymen. It would be doing a great injustice to most of the teachers of philosophy at Athens to suppose that their practice or their principles were at variance with the ethical doctrines which they taught. Whatever may be said against Epicurus and his garden, the well-known story of Xenocrates and Polemon² truly represents the general effects of the academic teaching on the dissolute youth who were brought into immediate contact with it. There is no reason to believe that either the Sceptics or the Peripatetics gave the slightest countenance to any laxity of morals.³ And the Stoics undoubtedly insisted on the strictest and severest code of self-discipline.⁴ The degradation of speculative philosophy at Athens did not arise from any unworthy compliances with the spirit of the age, which fostered it as the substitute for other forms of intellectual excitement. It was the natural effect of the want of life and vigour, which in this as in other fields sooner or later followed the downfall of political independence, and converted the free utterances of those who felt that they had a vocation to speak on the human mind and on nature, into the

¹ The subject of the *hetæra* in particular is formally discussed in the continuation of Barthelemy's *Anacharse*, entitled *Fêtes et Courtisanes de la Grèce*, tome IV., and in F. Jacob's *Vermischte Schriften*, IV. pp. 309 sqq.

² See below, § 3.

³ It is expressly said that even Stilpo, whose character did not stand very high, and that, too, in a convivial moment, reproached Glycera with corrupting the morals of the Athenian youth (Athen. XIII. p. 584 A).

⁴ The practice of Ariston of Chios is expressly placed in contrast to his doctrines in the well-known remark of Eratosthenes.

artificial and ingenious euphuism of men, who played with systems, who had a professional vanity to gratify, who were resolved to be original, and who had no fixed principles or normal convictions to regulate the wayward extravagances of their intellectual ambition. This was the main difference between Plato, who struggled with the difficulty of expressing thoughts which rose spontaneously in his mind, and Epicurus and Chrysippus, who vied with one another in writing for writing's sake, and who multiplied disquisitions without caring much either for the foundations of their arguments or the consistency of their results.¹

In tracing the development of these later schools of philosophy, we must go back for a starting-point to the classical period of Greek literature. At the death of Aristotle, two schools of philosophy were established at Athens: that of the Academy, in which he had himself studied, and which was maintained in Aristotle's life-time by Speusippus, the nephew of Plato,² and his own friend and travelling companion, Xenocrates; and that of the Lyceum, which he had founded as the seat of his peripatetic system, and which after his death was conducted by his scholar, Theophrastus. For a while the Socratic family was represented at Athens only by these manifestations of the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle. But the older Socratic schools soon reappeared with new names and corresponding extensions of teaching. The Megarics, with an infusion of the doctrines of Democritus, revived in the sceptic philosophy of Pyrrhon; Epicurus founded the sect, to which he gave his name, by a similar combination of Democritean philosophy with the doctrines of the Cyrenaics; the Cynics were developed into Stoics by Zeno, who borrowed much from the Megaric school on one hand, and from the old Academy on the other; and finally the middle and new Academy arose from a fusion of much that was peculiar to many of these sects, for the Sceptics, the Peripatetics, the Megarics, and the old Academy, all furnished materials for the teaching of Arcesilaus.

¹ Diog. Laërt. X. 26: ἐξήλουν δ' αὐτὸν (Ἐπικούρου) Χρύσιππος ἐν πολυγραφίᾳ, κατὰ φησι καὶ Καρνεάδης, παράσιτον αὐτὸν τῶν βιβλίων ἀποκαλῶν· εἰ γάρ τι γράψαι ὁ Ἐπίκουρος, ἐφίλονεῖκε τοιοῦτον γράψαι ὁ Χρύσιππος.

² He was the son of Eurymedon by Plato's sister Potone (Diog. Laërt. IV. 1).

In this order we propose to discuss the various schools, which flourished in rivalry or succession at Athens, while Greece was under the dominion of Alexander's successors.

§ 3. When Plato died in B.C. 347, he was succeeded in his school near the Academia by his nephew SPEUSIPPUS, who occupied his post for eight years from that time. The two most eminent scholars of the great philosopher, Xenocrates of Chalcedon, and Aristotle, went, as we have mentioned in a former chapter, to visit Hermecas, the ruler of Atarneus, and they passed from thence to Macedonia, where Aristotle became the tutor of Alexander. Xenocrates did not reside any long time at Philip's court, but he was sent as ambassador more than once to that monarch and his successor Antipater. When Speusippus died of a lingering paralytic affection in B.C. 339,¹ XENOCRATES succeeded to his office, which seems to have been attached to the possession and occupancy of Plato's house and garden, and he presided over the academy for twenty-five years. It is probable that owing to the failing health of Speusippus, he had taken an active part in the teaching of the school before the decease of that philosopher. POLEMON, the son of Philostratus, succeeded Xenocrates in B.C. 315.² His conversion to philosophy is one of the best known anecdotes in ancient history.³ He had been, up to the age of thirty, distinguished only by the shameless profligacy of his life. Early one morning, after a debauch prolonged through the night, he entered the school of Xenocrates, still adorned with the insignia of his revelry; but the philosopher, undisturbed by the interruption, continued his discourse on modesty and temperance with such effect, that the young man, who came to scoff, flung down his chaplet of flowers, and became from that hour a regular attendant at the Academia, over which he ultimately presided till his death, at an advanced age, in B.C. 270.⁴ Polemon had two friends, supporters, and colleagues, in the management of Plato's school; CRANTOR of Soli, who had been a pupil of Xenocrates, and was

¹ Diog. Laërt. IV. 3.

² Clinton, *F. H.* II. p. 171.

³ See Diog. Laërt. III. 16; Horat. II. *Serm.* III. 254; Valerius Maximus, VI. 9, ext. 1; Suidas, s.v. Πολέμων Φιλοστράτου; August. *epp. ad Cirtens.* 130; *contr. Julian.* I. 12.

⁴ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 9.

carried off by a dropsy before the death of Polemon,¹ and CRATES of Athens, who for a short time succeeded to the presidency of the Academia.² These were the chief philosophers of the old academy, and a new modification of their teaching was introduced, as we shall see, by Arcesilaus, the inheritor of Crantor's fortune.

It cannot be said that the old academy occupies a prominent place in the history of Greek philosophy, and its contributions to Greek literature, which were sufficiently numerous,³ are now represented only by the *Epinomis* included among the works of Plato, which, whether or not the work of Philip of Opus,⁴ is beyond all doubt a product of this school; and, by the version which Cicero has given us of Crantor's treatise 'On Sorrow,' (*περὶ πένθους*), in the third book of his *Tusculan Disputations*.⁵ Both Speusippus and Xenocrates were learned men, and the former collected a library of so much value, that Aristotle was glad to buy it for three talents.⁶

We observe in these two leaders of the old academy a tendency to that Pythagorean fondness for mystic numbers and musical harmonies which we discern even in Plato,⁷ and Xenocrates carried this so far that he insisted on a distinction between two forms of the supreme God, according to his place

¹ Diog. Laërt. IV. 27.

² It seems that Crates, whose attachment to Polemon was almost proverbial, and who was buried in the same tomb with his friend and teacher, did not long survive him; see Diog. Laërt. IV. 21.

³ See the enumeration of the works of Speusippus, Xenocrates, and Crates, by Diogenes Laërtius, IV. 4, 5; 11-14; 23. He says also that Polemon left *ἱκανὰ συγγράμματα* (IV. 20).

⁴ Diog. Laërt. III. 37: *ἐνιοὶ δὲ φασιν ὅτι Φίλιππος ὁ Ὀπούντιος τοὺς Νόμους αὐτοῦ μετέγραψεν ὄντας ἐν κηρῷ. τούτου δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἐπινομίδα φασὶν εἶναι.* It has been supposed that the *Axiochus*, found among the works of Plato, was written by Xenocrates, but there are no sufficient grounds for this conclusion; see Wytténbach, *Opuscula*, I. p. 478.

⁵ See *Tusc. Disp.* IV. 29, § 71. Cicero took from this book most of the materials of his *Consolatio* on the death of his daughter Tullia (*Fragm.* p. 579), and the work was freely used by Plutarch in his *Consolatio ad Apollonium*; see Wytténbach, *Animadv. in Plut.* pp. 698, 714.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. IV. 5; Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* III. 17.

⁷ See, for example, Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* I. 4; *Metaph.* VII. 2; XIII. 6, 9; XIV. 4, 5; Stob. *Ecl.* I. p. 62; Cic. *Acad.* II. 39, § 124; *De Nat. Deor.* I. 13, § 34.

in the harmonic scale.¹ It was Xenocrates who first made a formal division of philosophy into the three great branches of dialectics, ethics, and physics;² but as we have seen, he only gave by this arrangement an external definiteness to what Plato had already done. The importance, which Plato manifestly assigns to pure mathematics, was formally maintained by Xenocrates, who assigned to geometry a place of equal rank with that which he claimed for philosophy in general.³ Polemon comparatively neglected dialectics, and bestowed his chief attention on ethics.⁴ His rule was that men should live agreeably to nature,⁵ and the recollections of his own early career, which he abandoned for a higher code of morality, must have led him to very different conclusions from those of the Cyrenaics and Epicureans, in regard to his natural criterion. In literature, his tastes led him to prefer the great poets to the prose writers, and we are told that his favourites were Homer and Sophocles.⁶ His friend Crantor was the earliest commentator on Plato;⁷ but he too had his favourites among the poets, from whom he selected Homer and Euripides as most worthy of admiration.⁸ He wrote poetry himself, and in an epitaph upon him by Theætetus,—not the geometer of that name—it is said that he pleased men, but pleased the Muses still more.⁹ His poems do not appear, however, to have been published, but were sealed up by him, and deposited in the temple of Minerva in his native city of Soli in Cilicia.¹⁰

¹ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* V. p. 604 : Ξενοκράτης τὸν μὲν ὕπατον Δία, τὸν δὲ νέατον καλῶν. Plut. *Plat. Quæst.* IX. 1 : ἥ καὶ Ξενοκράτης Δία τὸν ἐν μὲν τοῖς κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσιν ὕπατον καλεῖ, νέατον δὲ τὸν ὑπὸ σελήνῃν.

² Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* VII. 16.

³ See Brandis, in Smith's *Dictionary*, s. n. ; Ritter, *Hist. of Philos.* III. pp. 461-463, and the passages cited by them.

⁴ Diog. Laërt. IV. 18.

⁵ Cic. *De Fin.* IV. 6, § 14 : 'Polemo planissime secundum naturam vivere summum bonum esse dixit.' *Ib.* 16, § 45 ; 18, § 51.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. IV. 21 : ἔλεγεν οὖν τὸν μὲν Ὅμηρον ἐπικὸν εἶναι Σοφοκλέα, τὸν δὲ Σοφοκλέα Ὅμηρον τραγικόν.

⁷ Proclus, in *Timæum*, p. 24.

⁸ Diog. Laërt. IV. 26.

⁹ *Id.* 25 :

ἦνδανεν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ δ' ἐπὶ πλεόν ἦνδανε Μούσαις
Κράντωρ, καὶ γήρως ἤλυθεν οὗτι πρόσω.

¹⁰ *Id.* *ibid.* : λέγεται δὲ καὶ ποιήματα γράψαι καὶ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερῷ σφραγισάμενος αὐτὰ θεῖναι.

§ 4. There is a well-known story that Aristotle on his death-bed, being asked whether Theophrastus of Lesbos, or Eudemus of Rhodes, was the better fitted to assume the presidency of his school, sent for Lesbian and Rhodian wine, and after tasting both, pronounced them equal in excellence, but gave his own preference to the Lesbian.¹ Whether this anecdote is well-founded or not, it is clear that he left his books to Theophrastus, and made him one of his executors; and it is equally certain that the Lesbian was better fitted by his originality and literary talents to represent his master at the Lyceum than the Rhodian, who was a mere commentator on Aristotle,² and sometimes little better than a copyist, as we see from the *Eudemian Ethics*, which were probably composed by him.³

TYRTAMUS, of Eresus, in the island of Lesbos, usually known by his surname THEOPHRASTUS, which he is said to have received from Aristotle on account of his eloquence,⁴ was probably born about B.C. 374, and died in B.C. 287.⁵ He came to Athens before B.C. 347, for he was at first a pupil of Plato.⁶ It has been supposed that his connexion with Aristotle commenced while the latter was engaged in the education of Alexander.⁷ The selection of Theophrastus to act with Antipater as the executor of Aristotle, and the favour with which he was always regarded by the Macedonian party at Athens, encourage the supposition that he had formed an early connexion with the court of Pella. Demetrius Phalereus, the agent of Cassander, procured for him a house and garden of his own after the death of Aristotle,⁸ and this property, which

¹ Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* XIII. 5.

² Simplic. *Phys.* fol. 29 a, 44 a, 94 a, 201 b, &c., quoted by Ritter, p. 356.

³ Above, ch. XL. § 6.

⁴ Diog. Laërt. V. 38: τοῦτον Τύρταμον λεγόμενον, Θεόφραστον διὰ τὸ τῆς φράσεως θεσπέσιον Ἀριστοτέλης μετωνόμασεν. Cic. *Orator.* 19; Strabo, p. 618.

⁵ The date of his death is fixed by the succession of Straton in B.C. 287 (Diog. Laërt. V. 58; cf. 36). His birth-year depends upon his age, which is differently assigned. Diogenes says he was eighty-five (V. 40); others give him still greater longevity.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. V. 36.

⁷ Blakesley, *Life of Aristotle*, p. 56.

⁸ Diog. Laërt. V. 39: λέγεται δ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἴδιον κῆπον σχεῖν μετὰ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους τελευτήν, Δημητρίῳ Φαληρέως, ὃς ἦν καὶ γνώριμος αὐτῷ, τοῦτο συμπράξαντος.

probably included the original establishment of the Peripatetic school, was left by Theophrastus to his successor Straton and his other friends, on the express condition that it was to be regarded as a philosophical college.¹ His residence at Athens to the end of his long life was only once interrupted, when, on the proposal of Sophocles in B.C. 306, he was banished from Attica, together with the other philosophers. But this decree was rescinded in the following year on the proposal of Philo, one of Aristotle's scholars, and Theophrastus returned to the Lyceum.² He was surrounded by a crowd of pupils, it is said by as many as two thousand, and the most eminent men at Athens, including the poet Menander, attended his lectures.³ In speculative points he often departed from the theories of Aristotle, which perhaps he did not always understand.⁴ But in many departments, especially in some branches of natural history, he extended and improved what had been done by his master. His treatise 'on stones,' published B.C. 315, 314, that 'on the causes of plants,' which appeared a year or two afterwards, and the great work on botany, which was put forth after the year 307 B.C.,⁵ have superseded Aristotle's works on similar subjects, and his collection of laws⁶ would have been a valuable appendage to Aristotle's great work on the politics, had the two books been preserved to our time. With the exception of the botanical treatises, and a little book 'on characteristics,' the numerous writings of Theophrastus are either lost altogether, or have come down to us in mere fragments. He is best known to Greek students by the last-named book—the *Χαρακτῆρες*, or *notationes morum*—which, in a prefatory letter to Polyces, or Polycleides, he describes as the fruit of a long life's experience, of much social intercourse and careful obser-

¹ Diog. Laërt. V. 51.

² *Id.* V. 38.

³ *Id.* V. 36, 37.

⁴ See Ritter, III. p. 363.

⁵ Clinton, *F. H.* II. p. 366.

⁶ Νόμων κατὰ στοιχείον κδ', νόμων ἐπιτομῆς ι, νομοθετῶν γ', πολιτικῶν ε', πολιτικῶν ἐθῶν δ', περὶ τῆς ἀρίστης πολιτείας α', are some of his political works mentioned by Diogenes (V. 44, 45). It is worthy of remark, that Theophrastus was the first writer out of Italy who entered with any detail into Roman history. Plin. *H. N.* III. 5, § 57: 'Theophrastus, qui primus externorum aliqua de Romanis diligentius scripsit (nam Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit, urbem dumtaxat a Gallis captam dixit, Clitarchus, ab eo proximus, legationem tantum, ad Alexandrum missam), hic jam plus,' &c.

vation.¹ Traits, similar to those which Aristotle personifies in the second book of his *Rhetoric*, are represented in a series of personal pictures very carefully finished. The illustrations are of course taken from the every-day life of Athens, but there is so much intrinsic truth in the descriptions, that they must always possess a general interest. It seems pretty clear, however, that the *Χαρακτῆρες*, as they have come down to us, are only a series of extracts made by the rhetoricians for their own use from the original work of Theophrastus, which was lost as early as the time of Stobæus.² All these fragments are found in manuscripts of the Greek rhetoricians, and the text is not only corrupt, but deformed by many transpositions, by which the characteristics are intermixed.³

ARISTOXENUS of Tarentum, and DICÆARCHUS of Messana, the former in some sense the rival, the latter the friend, of Theophrastus, were next to him the most celebrated Peripatetics among the immediate disciples of Aristotle. The former is best known by an elaborate work on the principles of musical harmony, which is still in existence,⁴ and which is probably made up of the fragments of two or more original treatises,⁵ and he was the founder of a school of music in opposition to

¹ *Proœm.* I. (the *Proœm.* II. or *Monacense*, substitutes the voc. Πολύκλειδες for Πολύκλεις): ἐγὼ γάρ, ὦ Πολύκλεις, συνθεωρήσας ἐκ πολλοῦ [χρόνου] τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν [καὶ βεβιωκὸς ἔτη ἑννεήκοντα ἐννέα: these words are probably a gloss; see Ast's note, p. 40], ἔτι δὲ ὠμίληκός πολλαῖς τε καὶ παντοδαπαῖς φύσεσι καὶ παραθεαμένους ἐξ ἀκριβείας πολλῆς τοὺς τε ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοὺς φαυλοὺς, ὑπέλαβον δεῖν συγγράψαι ἃ ἑκάτεροι αὐτῶν ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ.

² Dobree, in a note on the *Plutus* (*Porsoni Aristophanica*, p. 129), to which our attention has been directed by a learned friend, states, on the strength of his memory, that Porson 'putabat falso tribui Theophrasto characteras, antiquos tamen esse concedens,' and says, with regard to the allusion in *Charact.* VII.: τὴν ἐπ' Ἀριστοφώντος ποτε γερόμενος τοῦ ῥήτορος μάχην,—'hæc etsi contendas a Theophrasto scribi potuisse, ut qui plus X.L. annos superstes fuerit post habitam orationem de Coronâ, fateberis tamen a recentiore sophistâ potius quam ab æquali philosopho expectandum esse, ut τοῦ ῥήτορος nomine designetur Demosthenes.' See above, chapter XLI. § 6, note.

³ That Theophrastus carried his love for characterizing even to mimicry is clear from the anecdote related by Athenæus (I. p. 214), on the authority of Hermippus.

⁴ Ἀριστοξένου ἀρμονικῶν στοιχείων in three books, published in Meibomius, *Antiquæ Musicæ Scriptores Septem*, Amstelod. 1652.

⁵ Burney's *History of Music*, I. p. 442.

that of the Pythagoreans. Dicæarchus, whose numerous writings have all perished, with the exception of fragments more or less considerable, and more or less of doubtful authenticity, was chiefly distinguished as a writer on history, geography, and antiquities. His work, entitled 'the life of Greece' (βίος τῆς Ἑλλάδος), seems to have been an elaborate account of the topography, political condition, and religious and social usages of all the Greek states.¹ It was perhaps suggested by Aristotle's work on the politics, and by Theophrastus' collections of laws. We have a long fragment of the second book,² which is perhaps derived from some epitome of the work.³ His 'measurements of mountains' (καταμετρήσεις τῶν ὄρων) may have belonged to the accessory labours required by his great work; and his 'description of the world' (γῆς περίοδος) seems to have been merely the description attached to the set of maps which he constructed for his friend Theophrastus, to whom he has dedicated the description of Greece (ἀναγραφὴ τῆς Ἑλλάδος), still extant in 105 iambic lines, if it is not one of those later paraphrases, of which we have many examples, derived from the γῆς περίοδος. The *τριπολιτικὸς* of Dicæarchus has been made the subject of a good deal of ingenious speculation. The most plausible opinion⁴ about it is that which is derived from the definition in Photius of the Dicæarchian form of government, as consisting of a combination of the best ingredients in monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. Both Aristoxenus and Dicæarchus introduced important modifications into Aristotle's theory of the soul. They both regarded it as a harmony or condition resulting from a certain adjustment of the composite elements of the

¹ See Augustus Buttmann *de Dicæarcho ejusque operibus quæ inscribuntur Blos Ἑλλάδος et ἀναγραφὴ Ἑλλάδος*.

² Buttmann, u. s. pp. 20-35.

³ The work on the Spartan constitution, which was annually read to the youth of Sparta, was probably a portion of the *Blos τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (see *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* vol. II. *ad Dicæarchi Fr.* 21).

⁴ This opinion is due to Osann (quoted in Smith's *Dictionary*, I. p. 1001). The words of Photius are: ἕτερον εἶδος πολιτείας εἰσάγει, δ καλεῖ δικαιοκρατικὸν . . . ἣν δ' αὐτοὶ πολιτείαν εἰσάγουσιν ἐκ τριῶν εἰδῶν τῆς πολιτείας δέον αὐτὴν συγκεῖσθαι φασί, βασιλικῆ καὶ ἀριστοκρατικῆ καὶ δημοκρατικῆ, τὸ εὐκρινὲς αὐτῇ ἐκάστης τῆς πολιτείας συνεισαγωγίσης, κάκεινην τὴν ὡς ἀρίστην πολιτείαν ἀποτελοῦσης (*Bibl. fol.* XXXVII. p. 23.)

body,¹ and Dicæarchus did not shrink from the conclusion that the soul was therefore not immortal.²

STRATO of Lampsacus, who succeeded Theophrastus in B.C. 287, had previously spent some time at Alexandria, and was one of the teachers of Ptolemy Philadelphus.³ He obtained a great reputation as an acute disputant, and evinced considerable ability in his criticisms of other systems of philosophy, which he did not scruple to misrepresent.⁴ His own views tended, like those of Aristoxenus and Dicæarchus, to a sort of materialism. He not only made the soul a mere function of the body, but even phrenologized it by placing it in the forehead.⁵ He was called distinctively 'the naturalist' (ὁ φυσικός), because he referred everything to nature, without requiring the intervention of a deity.⁶ He thus passed from Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of motion into a sort of pantheism. He departed still more from the principles of Aristotle in neglecting entirely both natural science and political history, to which Theophrastus and Dicæarchus had made important contributions, and in reducing the peripatetic system to controversial metaphysics, and merely speculative views of nature unsupported by an appeal to experience, he prepared the way for the disrepute into which the Lyceum very speedily fell. His successors, LYCON,⁷ ARISTON of Ceos,⁸ and CRITOLAUS,⁹ became

¹ Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* I. 10, § 20, 21. 18, § 41; Sext. Emp. *Hyp. Pyrrh.* II. 31; *adv. Matth.* VII. 349.

² Cic. *Tusc.* I. 31. Atticus apud Euseb. *Pr. Ev.* XV. 9, p. 810 A, p. 395, Heinichen: τούτῳ τοιγαροῦν ἐπόμενος Δικαίαρχος καὶ κατ' ἀκόλουθον ἱκανὸς ὦν θεωρεῖν, ἀνῆρκε τὴν ὅλην ὑπόστασιν τῆς ψυχῆς. ³ Diog. Laërt. V. 58.

⁴ Polyb. *Ecc. Vat.* XII. 12: ὅταν ἐγχειρήσῃ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων δόξας διαστέλλεσθαι καὶ ψευδοποιεῖν θαυμάσιός ἐστιν.

⁵ Plut. *de Placitis Philosophorum*, IV. 5, p. 899: τί τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐστίν; Πλάτων, Δημόκριτος, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ κεφαλῇ. Στράτων ἐν μεσοφρύφῳ.

⁶ Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* I. 13, § 35: 'nec audiendus est Strato, is qui *physicus* appellatur, qui omnem vim divinam in naturâ sitam esse censet.' Cf. *Acad.* II. 38; *De Fin.* V. 5, § 13.

⁷ Cic. *De Fin.* V. 5, § 13: 'Lyco oratione locuples, rebus ipsis jejuniôr.'

⁸ *Id. ibid.*: 'concinnus deinde et elegans hujus Aristo: sed ea, quæ desideratur a magno philosopho, gravitas in eo non erat. Scripta sane et multa et polita: sed nescio quo pacto auctoritatem oratio non habet.' Of the writings of Ariston of Ceos many were attributed to his namesake of Chios. But it is clear that the ἐρωτικά διατριβαί (Athen. X. p. 419 et al.), and the Λύκων (Plut. *De Audiend. Poet.* 1) were by this Peripatetic. For his rhetoric see Quintil. II. 15, § 19.

⁹ Critolaus is best known from his having been the colleague of Carneades in the

merely the exponents of the philosophy of rhetoric, to which the ethics of Aristotle furnished some commonplace illustrations, until the school was virtually superseded by that of the Stoics.

§ 5. Among the literary men and artists who accompanied Alexander on his eastern expedition was PYRRHON of Elis, originally a painter, afterwards a small poet, then a disciple of the Megaric school, and finally a humble companion of Anaxarchus, the Democritean philosopher, under whose patronage he attached himself to the Macedonian camp.¹ He attracted the favourable notice of Alexander by a poem, for which he received the munificent reward of ten thousand pieces of gold.² Pyrrhon took a part in the Indian campaign, and in this way became acquainted with the doctrines and practices of the gymnosophists. The tenets of these Indian sages are now well known to us, and there does not appear to be any sufficient reason for the statement quoted by Diogenes from Ascanius of Abdera,³ that Pyrrhon derived all the details of his scepticism from his intercourse with them, though they no doubt produced their influence on his system. It is inferred that he was born in B.C. 375, and that his life was prolonged to B.C. 285.⁴ His career, therefore, was co-extensive with one of the most important periods in the history of ancient philosophy. Trained in the Megaric school, initiated at an early period into the materialism of Democritus, he had been within the reach of the comprehensive teaching of Plato and Aristotle, he had surveyed the imperturbable calmness and sublime indifference of the sages of India, and he lived long enough to see the decline of the old Academy and of the Peripatetics, and to witness the rise of the Stoics and Epicureans. Though the

well-known embassy to Rome (Cic. *De Orat.* II. 37, § 155). He is described by Cicero (*De Fin.* V. 5, § 14) as having aimed at imitating the ancient Peripatetics: 'et quidem est gravitate proximus et redundat oratio.'

¹ Diog. Laërt. IX. 61, 62; Aristocles *apud Euseb. Pr. Ev.* XIV. 18; Suidas, s. n.

² Sextus Empiricus *adv. Gramm.* I. § 282.

³ XI. 61: 'Αναξάρχου ξυνακολουθῶν πανταχοῦ ὡς καὶ τοῖς Γυμνοσοφισταῖς ἐν Ἰνδίᾳ ζυμμιζαὶ καὶ τοῖς Μάγοις, ὅθεν γενναϊότατα δοκεῖ φιλοσοφῆσαι τὸ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας καὶ ἐποχῆς εἶδος εἰσαγαγόν, ὡς Ἀσκάνιος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησὶν.

⁴ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 476.

martyrdom of Socrates was for him a story of the past, he knew how his own friend and companion Anaxarchus had endured the horrid tortures inflicted on him by Nicocreon.¹ The camp and the court had taught him the falsehood and vanity of the world. And when he returned to Greece—probably to his native city, Elis—he was prepared by a long apprenticeship for the establishment of a system of negative philosophy. Retiring from the world into the citadel of his own inner being, he regarded all that was external to his soul, even his bodily frame, with much indifference and some doubt as to its existence. He revived in its most uncompromising form the argument which Plato so elaborately refutes in his *Theætetus*, and maintained that the only criterion of reality was the outward appearance.² ‘I do not assert,’ he would say, ‘that anything is sweet: I admit that it appears so.’³ He conceived that the only condition that was worthy of a philosopher was one of suspended judgment (ἐποχή).⁴ The doctrines of the Pyrrhonians were thus expressed by four names which they assumed or accepted: they were inquirers (ζητητικοί), who sought the truth; examiners or sceptics (σκεπτικοί), who always considered and never discovered; ephectics (ἐφεκτικοί), from the suspense (ἐποχή) to which we have just referred; and doubters (ἀπορητικοί), from the logical dilemma in which their reasonings entangled them.⁵ They carried their suspension (ἐποχή) or abstinence from assertion (ἀφασία) so far that they would not even assert that they enunciated any proposition.⁶ In morals, they aimed at an absence of emotion (ἀταραξίαν) in regard to what was agreeable, and a moderation of the feelings (μετριοπάθεια) in regard to things compulsory and unpleasant.⁷ In

¹ Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* II. 22, § 52; *De Nat. Deor.* III. 33, § 82; Diog. Laërt. IX. 58; Justin, XII. 13, 4; Pliny, *H. N.* VII. 23.

² Diog. Laërt. IX. 106: ἔστιν οὖν κριτήριον κατὰ τοὺς σκεπτικούς τὸ φαινόμενον.

³ *Id.* 105: καὶ ἐν τοῖς περὶ αἰσθήσεων φησί, τὸ μέλι ὅτι ἐστὶ γλυκὺ οὐ τίθημι, τὸ δ’ ὅτι φαίνεται ὁμολογῶ.

⁴ Aristocles *apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* XIV. 18; Diog. Laërt. IX. 61.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. IX. 69, 70.

⁶ *Id.* 74: ἕως δὲ τοῦ προφέρεσθαι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ διηγείσθαι, μηδὲν ὀρίζοντες, μηδ’ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ὥστε καὶ τὸ μὴ ὀρίξειν ἀνήρουν, λέγοντες οἷον, οὐδὲν ὀρίζομεν, ἐπεὶ ὠρίζον ἄν. Cf. Plato, *Theætet.* p. 183 A.

⁷ Sext. Emp. *Pyrrhon. Hypotyp.* I. 25: φάμεν δὲ ἄχρι νῦν τέλος εἶναι τοῦ σκεπτικοῦ τὴν ἐν τοῖς δόξαις ἀταραξίαν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατηναγκασμένοις μετριοπάθειαν.

general, the true Pyrrhonian sceptic proclaimed his indifference to the ordinary interests of humanity, and endeavoured, as far as was possible for a Greek, to imitate the incredulous apathy of the Indian gymnosophists.¹

With the exception of the verses by which Pyrrhon obtained from Alexander the same reward as that which he bestowed, according to Horace, on the faulty compositions of Chœrilus,² the founder of the Sceptics wrote nothing, and took credit to himself on this account for a freedom from literary vanity.³ The interpreter of his opinions was TIMON of Phlius, whom we have already mentioned as a writer of *Silli*,⁴ and who was called the prophet or mouthpiece of Pyrrhon.⁵ Of this voluminous writer in what we should call Hudibrastic verse, we have the following account on the authority of Apollonides of Nicæa.⁶ His father Timarchus having left him an orphan at a very early age, he was obliged to seek a subsistence as a choric dancer.⁷ He then went to Megara to attend the lectures of Stilpo (this is supposed to have been about B.C. 310),⁸ and after some stay there returned home and married. Accompanied by his wife he proceeded to Elis where he attached himself to Pyrrhon. Poverty obliged him to migrate to Chalcedon, where he made some money as a teacher of rhetoric, and was enabled to establish himself at Athens. In the course of his travels he became acquainted with Antigonius and Ptolemy Philadelphus. Like his master Pyrrhon he died at the advanced age of ninety,⁹ when, it is not known; but he lived long enough to satirize the

¹ Diog. Laërt. IX. 62, 63, 66, 68.

² II. *Ep.* I. 232 :

Gratus Alexandro regi magno fuit ille
Chœrilus, incultis qui versibus et male natis
Rettulit acceptos, regale nomisma, Philippos.

³ Aristocles, ap. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* XIV. 18, p. 349, Heinichen : αὐτὸς δ' ὕστερον τοῦτον τὸν τύφον περιβαλλόμενος καὶ καλῶν ἀτυφον ἑαυτὸν, οὐδὲν ἐν γραφῇ κατέλιπεν.

⁴ Above, chapter XLV. § 8.

⁵ Sextus Empiricus, *adv. Grammat.* 53 : ὁ προφήτης τῶν Πύρρωνος λόγων.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. IX. 109 : Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεὺς ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν εἰς σὺλλους ὑπομνημάτων, ἃ προσφωνεῖ Τιβερίῳ Καίσαρι.

⁷ Aristocles, u. s. p. 346, Heinichen : ἀντὶ χορευτοῦ φιλόσοφος ἐγένετο.

⁸ Clinton, *F. H.* III. s. aa. 279, 272.

⁹ Diog. Laërt. IX. 112, on the authority of Antigonius and Sotion.

Museum of Alexandria, and to make caustic remarks on the criticism of the text of Homer,¹ which was, as we have seen, a chief employment of that school from the time of Zenodotus to that of Aristarchus. Timon was a very voluminous writer, and, besides the *Silli* mentioned in a former chapter, he wrote, we are told, satirical dramas, thirty comedies, sixty tragedies, the *Python*,² and other satirical poems; he also published treatises on the perceptions, an attack on the natural philosophers, and other prose works amounting in all to 20,000 lines.³ Our acquaintance with his doctrines and those of his master is derived chiefly from the writings of Sextus Empiricus, a physician of the third century after Christ. The philosophy of the negative school is only a link of connexion between Plato and Aristotle, and the Epicureans and Stoics. 'At best,' says Ritter,⁴ 'scepticism is nothing more than a transition to a new intellectual development, and indicates a state of mental culture, in which, with a persuasion that truth is not to be found in sensible phenomena, there exists a conviction that the development, which science has already attained to, does not present a mean whereby the inquirer may raise himself above the sensible.'

§ 6. The Epicurean philosophy, which shows its wide and permanent influence by the fact that its founder's name is a common term in our own language at the present day, owes its origin to EPICURUS the son of Neocles, an Athenian *cleruchus* or 'squatter,' in the island of Samos, where the future philosopher was born on the seventh day of Gamelion, Ol. 109, 3. B.C. 342.⁵ His youth was spent in Samos and Teos. His first

¹ Diog. Laërt. IX. 113: φασὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀρατον πυθέσθαι αὐτοῦ πῶς τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν ἀσφαλῆ κτήσαιο, τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν 'εἰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυγχάνοι καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἡδὴ διωρθωμένοις.'

² That the Python was a poem in hexameter verse appears from Diog. Laërt. IX. 65, where some lines are quoted as common to the *Pytho* and the *Silli*. It appears from Aristocles (*apud Euseb.* p. 346, Heinichen), that it was in the form of a long dialogue between Timon and Pyrrhon on the road to Delphi, and, in this respect also, it resembled the *Silli*.

³ Diog. Laërt. IX. 111.

⁴ *History of Ancient Philosophy*, III. p. 398, Eng. Tr.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. X. 14, on the authority of Apollodorus. For the place of his birth and his Attic origin, see Diog. Laërt. X. 1, 3; Strabo, XIV. p. 171; Cic. *ad Div.* XV. 16.

instructor was his father, who kept an elementary school; and he used to assist his mother, who seems to have been a sort of sorceress, in the recitation of her magic spells.¹ So that his beginnings in life were not unlike those of Æschines the orator.² He used to boast that he had commenced the study of philosophy at the age of fourteen,³ and a story is told⁴ that he was remanded to this study by a grammatical teacher, perhaps his own father, who was reading Hesiod to him, and whom he puzzled with a question about the origin of Chaos. He went to Athens at the age of eighteen, and was said, though he denied it, to have attended the school of Xenocrates.⁵ The troubles consequent on the Lamian war induced him to remove to Colophon, where his family was now settled, and where he adopted his father's profession of a grammarian or schoolmaster. Chance threw the writings of Democritus in his way, and he found a congenial pursuit in the study of the atomic theory.⁶ He set up a school of Democritean philosophy, first at Mitylene, and afterwards at Lampsacus. His success induced him to return to Athens, where he was established from B.C. 306 to his death in B.C. 270, in the same year with Polemon of the old Academy and Straton of the Lyceum. At first he appeared simply as a Democritean,⁷ with perhaps some admixture of the Pyrrhonian doctrines.⁸ But he eventually set up for himself, and renouncing in the most contemptuous manner all connexion with any existing school, gathered around him his friends and admirers in a country house and garden near Athens, of which

¹ Diog. X. 4: καὶ γὰρ σὺν τῇ μητρὶ περιούντα αὐτὸν ἐς τὰ οἰκίδια καθαρμούς ἀναγιγνώσκειν καὶ σὺν τῷ πατρὶ γράμματα διδάσκειν λυπροῦ τινος μισθαρίου.

² That is to say, if we may believe Demosthenes (*De Coronâ*, p. 340).

³ Diog. Laërt. X. 2, 14.

⁴ Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* X. 18.

⁵ Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* I. 26, § 72; Diog. Laërt. X. 13.

⁶ Hence the satirical Timon calls him the 'last and worst of the physical philosophers' (Diog. Laërt. X. 2, 3): φησὶ δ' Ἑρμιππος . . . περιτυχόντα τοῖς Δημοκρίτου βιβλίοις ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἀΐξαι· διὸ καὶ τὸν Τίμωνα φάσκειν περὶ αὐτοῦ·

ὑστατος αὖ φυσικῶν καὶ κύντατος ἐκ Σάμου ἐλθὼν
γραμμαδιδασκαλίδης ἀναγωγότατος ζώντων.

⁷ Plutarch, *adv. Colot.* 3.

⁸ He got his Pyrrhonism from Nausiphanes (Aristocles, *apud Euseb. Pr. Ev.* XIV. 20, p. 768 D). Ariston, in his life of Epicurus, said, that the latter copied his *Canon* from the *Tripod* of Nausiphanes; Diog. Laërt. X. 14.

he had become the proprietor.¹ Here, in a sort of Pythagorean College, with a common table,² to which all contributed, the Epicureans indulged in social intercourse, and tranquil enjoyment. Frequented as the school was by literary courtesans,³ it is not likely that prudery or puritanism restrained the members of this Agapemone; but it is a slander to say that they were guilty of the grosser immoralities of the day.⁴ And whatever may be thought of METRODORUS,⁵ it seems clear that Epicurus himself did not violate his own principles by an immoderate pursuit of sensual pleasure.⁶

An adequate discussion of the philosophy of Epicurus, such as it was, does not belong to a work like the present. As his voluminous writings have perished, with the exception of three letters,⁷ and the summary of his 'leading principles' (*κυρία δόξαι*),⁸ he occupies a very unimportant place in Greek literature. Even if we had more of his writings, it is doubtful whether his literary eminence would be much enhanced. He was a man of little learning, and perhaps no philosophical originality. His physical system, which was mainly derived from the Democriteans, was only pursued with a view to his ethical principles, which were based upon those of the Cyrenaics, with some corrections derived from Aristotle. And his logic, or, as he called it, *canonic*,⁹ was designed to furnish a basis for both the moral system, which made happiness, the end of life, to consist in a

¹ Pliny, *H. N.* XIX. 4; Diog. Laërt. X. 2, 10.

² There was, however, no community of property after the manner of Pythagoras, for Epicurus thought this argued a distrust unworthy of real friendship. Diog. Laërt. X. 11.

³ Diog. Laërt. X. 7.

⁴ This, however, was often said, especially by the Stoics (Cic. *ad Div.* VII. 26), and it was not uncommon to speak of the fraternity as a sty, in which the so-called philosophers wallowed like hogs (cf. Cic. *Pis.* 16: 'Epicure noster, ex harâ pro ducte, non ex scholâ.' Horat. *Epist.* I. 4, 16: 'Epicuri de grege porcum').

⁵ Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* I. 40, § 113; *Tusc. Disp.* V. 9, § 27; *De Fin.* II. 28, 92.

⁶ Sen. *Epist.* 18.

⁷ Diog. Laërt. X. 35 sqq.

⁸ This work is briefly but accurately described by Cicero (*De Finibus*, II. 7, § 20): 'in alio vero libro, in quo breviter comprehensis gravissimis sententiis, quasi oracula edidisse sapientiæ dicitur, scribit his verbis, quæ nota tibi profecto, Torquate, sunt: quis enim vestrûm non edidicit Epicuri *κυρίας δόξας*, id est, *quasi maxime ratas*, quia gravissimæ sint ad beate vivendum breviter enuntiatae sententiæ?'

⁹ Diog. Laërt. X. 27: *περὶ κριτηρίου ἢ κἀνων.*

recollection or mental anticipation of sensual enjoyments, when they were no longer present; and for his physics, in which he endeavoured by means of the atomistic theory to relieve the mind from all apprehensions of a future state, which might have tended to mar the tranquillity of its present enjoyments. As far as we can judge, he was neither a lucid, nor an eloquent, nor a consistent writer;¹ and he has derived more credit than was due to him from the exposition of his views by Lucretius, one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of the Latin poets.² As far as we can see, the only object which Epicurus proposed to himself was the gratification of his personal vanity by gathering around him a body of admirers, to whom he would be everything; and by providing for the perpetuation of his name and memory. He predicted that those to whom he wrote letters would become immortal by his mention of them;³ and he settled his house and garden on his school, with the express provision that his philosophy should be taught there, and that his memory should be celebrated by annual commemorations.⁴ In the perpetuation of his name he has been amply gratified; but the discrimination of his successors has not exempted from the fate of many better contributions to Greek literature the bulky works⁵ of a man who was both vain and shallow, who dwelt on the same ideas with wearisome repetition, and who, having but little originality, thought to secure his personal importance by disparaging the labours of those to whom he was most indebted.⁶ Still it cannot be denied that by his concentrated energy in the pursuit of one object—the establishment

¹ See H. Ritter, *Hist. of Philos.* III. pp. 404, 405.

² In one point above all others Lucretius stands on a footing of pronounced superiority to Epicurus, namely, in the scientific spirit which he evinces throughout, and in which Epicurus was singularly deficient. He also takes much stricter views of domestic morality than could have been derived from the garden of Epicurus; see *e.g.* V. 1012, and the remarks of Renouvier, *Man. de Philos. Anc.* II. p. 297.

³ Senecæ, *Epist.* II. 9, § 3: 'si gloriâ, inquit, tangeris, notio rem epistolæ meae te facient quam omnia ista quæ colis et propter quæ coleris.'

⁴ Diog. Laërt. X. 18; Cic. *De Fin.* II. 31, § 103.

⁵ They amounted, according to Diogenes, to three hundred rolls (κύλινδροι), and he surpassed all Greek writers in voluminousness (X. 26).

⁶ Cic. *De Nat. Deor.*, I. 33, § 93; Diog. Laërt., X. 7, 8; Plut. *adv. Colot.* 26; Athen. VIII. p. 354 C.

of a system of which he was to be the centre—Epicurus produced a great effect on the theories of the few centuries immediately succeeding his own, and rivalled the influence of the Stoics when his doctrines and theirs were domesticated at Rome. In an age of growing scepticism and reckless luxury, men were too apt to seize upon anything like a systematic justification of their maxim—‘let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.’¹ And Epicureanism became a fashionable heresy, which thrived, like other fallacies, because it met half-way the natural inclinations of a corrupted society.

§ 7. As the Cyrenaics and Cynics exhibited two opposite applications of a principle derived from Socrates, the Stoics, who were regarded as a continuation of the latter,² no less than the Epicureans, who represented the characteristic positions of the former, may be considered as corresponding divergencies from the negative philosophy of Pyrrhon. They both originated in the sense of isolation which arose in the minds of thinking men, when they looked on the misery and corruption of the world around them. To this feeling the Sceptics gave merely a negative expression. The Epicureans sought a vulgar and perhaps instinctive remedy in a theory, which annihilated the future life, and made the most of present enjoyments. The Stoics proclaimed the nobler doctrine, that, for the wise man at any rate, the outer world and present circumstances had neither charms nor terrors, and he, at all events, would find the true end of life and the real happiness of man, in the performance of duty and in the pursuit of virtue. In the effects which they produced upon the literature of Greece, the Stoics were as superior to the Epicureans as they were in the consistency of

¹ Although this phrase was finally adopted by the Epicureans (Seneca, *Controv.* 14: ‘convivæ certe tui dicunt, Bibamus, moriendum est’), it was as old as the ancient Egyptians (Herod. II. 78), and was inscribed on the tomb of Sardanapalus (Athen. XII. p. 529 F) in cuneiform characters, of which perhaps Col. Rawlinson may discover the original text. It is adopted by Isaiah (XXII. 13), and borrowed from him by St. Paul (*ad Cor.*, I. 15, 32). It is paraphrased by Euripides (*Alcest.* 782).

² *Juv.* XIII. 120:

Accipe quæ contra valeat solatia ferre
Et qui nec Cynicos, nec Stoica dogmata legit
A Cynicis tunicâ distantia; non Epicurum
Suspicit exigui lætum plantaribus horti.

their logic and the validity and worth of their moral system. While the only literary product of the Epicurean school, which has obtained a permanent reputation, is the Latin poem of Lucretius, which is quite as much indebted to Democritus as it is to the philosophical plagiarist of the Garden, 'the budge doctors of the Stoic fur,' as our Milton calls them,¹ formed a system of logic, which was accepted as an improvement of the Aristotelian *Organon*; they introduced a grammatical nomenclature, which is still taught in all our schools; and though the philosophical writings of the great masters are entirely lost, their moral system has been adequately expounded in Greek by Epictetus, Arrian, and the Emperor Marcus Antoninus;² and in Latin, by Cicero, who opposed, and by Seneca, who adopted it.

The founder of the Stoic school was ZENO of Cittium in Cyprus, who was born about the same time as Epicurus, in Ol. 109, B.C. 344—341, and died at an advanced age, some time after the 150th Olympiad, B.C. 260—257.³ It is known that he was a contemporary of Antigonus Gonatas,⁴ that he had heard Polemon,⁵ and was acquainted with Arcesilaus.⁶ And these data will enable us to fix generally the period at which he lived. Like his father, he was originally a merchant. Some works on the Socratic philosophy—probably some of Plato's dialogues—which his father had brought with him from Athens,⁷ first turned his attention to speculative pursuits, and he eventually settled at Athens, having, it is said, lost all his property in a shipwreck.⁸ Another account leaves him in possession of an enormous fortune of one thousand talents.⁹ Perhaps there

¹ *Comus*:

O foolishness of men, that lend their ears
To those budge doctors of the Stoic fur.

The epithet 'budge,' signifying here 'tippeted with lambskin,' alludes to the doctoral attire of mediæval universities, which is supposed to be not unconnected with the *abolla* of the Stoics.

² See below, chap. LIV. § 2.

³ See Clinton, *F. H.* II. p. 368 i.

⁴ This appears from many circumstances mentioned by Diogenes Laërtius; see *e. g.* VII. 7.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. VII. 2.

⁶ Numenius *apud Euseb. Præp. Ev.*, XIV. 5, p. 729 B. Ritter (*Hist. of Phil.* III. p. 600, note) thinks that this is a mere fiction.

⁷ Diog. Laërt. VII. 31, on the authority of Demetrius the Magnesian.

⁸ *Id.* VII. 2, 4, 5. Seneca, *De Tranquill. An.* 14.

⁹ *Id.* VII. 13.

is little truth in either of these stories, which may have been invented to account, on the one hand, for his assumption of Cynic habits, and, on the other hand, to exaggerate the moderation for which his name was proverbial.¹ His first teacher at Athens was the Cynic, Crates;² and he received instruction also from Polemon, and even, it is said, from Xenocrates.³ He inclined more, however, to the Megaric school, and took Stilpo for his special model.⁴ After twenty years spent in philosophical studies,⁵ he had so far assumed an independent position by his modifications of existing systems⁶ as to be able to attract a number of followers, and he opened a school in a hall called 'the painted porch' (στοὰ ποικίλη),⁷ where there was a gallery of the pictures of Polygnotus, and where the poets had been accustomed to meet. Hence the name of 'Stoics,' or 'men of the porch,' which was given to his disciples. Though regarded at first with some contempt, from the poverty of the greater number of his scholars, and from the identification of his tenets with the principles of Cynicism, Zeno's influence gradually extended to all classes, and he found a warm admirer in Antigonus Gonatas, who often visited him in the most familiar manner.⁸ Late in life the king invited him to Macedonia, but the philosopher excused himself on the plea of his advanced age (being then eighty years old) and his infirm health, and sent instead of himself two of his hearers, Persæus and Philonides.⁹ The letter containing this invitation and Zeno's reply are given at length by Diogenes, but are probably forgeries. Zeno was in such high repute at Athens, that the people deposited in his hands the keys of the city gates,¹⁰ and after his death he was honoured with a public monument, and a decree bearing testimony to the uprightness of his life and

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 27 : ἤδη δὲ καὶ εἰς παροιμίαν σχεδὸν ἐχώρησεν. ἐλέγετο γοῦν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.

τοῦ φιλοσόφου Ζήνωνος ἐγκρατέστερος.

² *Id.* 3, 17, 22.

³ *Id.* 2, 35. Suid. s. n.

⁴ *Id.* 24. This was against the advice of Crates.

⁵ *Id.* 4.

⁶ Cicero, however, repeatedly asserts that he differed from his predecessors rather in his terminology than in his principles. See especially *De Fin.* IV.

² sqq.

⁷ Also called the Πεισιανάκτειον : Diog. Laërt. VII. 5.

⁸ *Id.* VII. 13 : ὡς πολλάκις Ἀντίγονον τὸν βασιλέα ἐπικωμάσαι αὐτῷ.

⁹ *Id.* 6 sqq. Arrian, *Epict.* III. 13.

¹⁰ Diog. Laert. VII. 6.

conduct.¹ Zeno lived like a hermit, confining his diet to water, figs, bread, and honey; and he is said to have put an end to his own life for some very unphilosophical reason.² The nature of the writings of Zeno is very imperfectly known to us. We have a catalogue in Diogenes³ of a number of books by him on ethics, rhetoric, logic, and criticism, together with some few apparently on physics. He commented on the moral philosophy of Crates in a special treatise (*Κράτητος ἠθικά*); his *Politics* were drawn up with a controversial reference to Plato, and he seems to have indulged in some extravagant paradoxes with regard to laws, customs, and religious observances;⁴ and his book 'on the life according to nature' (*περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου*) must have had for its object the position maintained by Polemon, and borrowed from him by the Stoics. There seems to have been a considerable difference between the tone and style of his earlier and his later writings, and his disciple Athenodorus is said to have endeavoured to obviate the inconsistency by expunging from the works of Zeno in the library at Pergamus all passages of a harsh and offensive nature.⁵

The main feature in the Stoicism of Zeno is the combination, which he attempted, between the principles of the Megarian and Cynic schools; and immediately after his death, two of his scholars formed a sort of opposition to one another, by giving prominence respectively to the Megaric and Cynic elements of Stoicism.⁶ ARISTON of Chios, who, as we have seen, had the distinguished honour of teaching Eratosthenes, fell back on Cynicism, and endeavoured to give an outward

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 10 sq., 29.

² The reason given (Diog. 28) is, that having fallen and broken his finger, he considered it as a summons from Pluto, and quoting, as he struck the ground with his hand, the words in the *Niobe*: *ἐρχομαι· τί μ' αἰεῖς*; he went home and strangled himself.

³ VII. 4.

⁴ See, for example, Plutarch, *De repugnantibus Stoicis*, cc. 6, 8; Diog. Laërt. VII. 32—34; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V. 584.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. VII. 34.

⁶ Schleiermacher has well remarked (*Gesch. d. Philosophie, Werke*, III. 4, 1, p. 133) that the main feature of Stoicism is the union of Cynicism with Megaricism. Zeno gave the preponderance to the Cynical element, because in his system dialectics were discouraged, and ethics brought to the front; whereas in Chrysippus the Megaric element preponderated on account of his special cultivation of logic. And Ariston and Herillus respectively followed the tendencies of Zeno and Chrysippus. 'Diese anfängliche Quadruplicität,' adds Schleiermacher, 'ist das Minia-

indication of this tendency by establishing his school in the Cynosarges.¹ His object was to confine all philosophy to ethics, and indeed to a part of ethics. 'Ariston,' says Seneca,² 'declared that physics and logic were not only superfluous, but contradictory. He even cut down ethics, which was the only branch of philosophy retained by him, for he discarded that part of it which deals with practical admonitions, declaring that it belonged to the schoolmaster rather than to the philosopher.' With a sort of tacit reference to the principles of Pyrrhon, he made the supreme good consist in an absolute indifference to everything except virtue and vice.³ He expressed his contempt for the pursuit of general knowledge by the celebrated saying that those who, neglecting philosophy, applied themselves to the encyclic sciences, were like the suitors of Penelope, who contented themselves with her handmaids because they could not win the mistress.⁴ With him there was only one virtue—the health of the soul⁵—and the philosopher had nothing to do with outward circumstances, except so far as they contributed to this. As we have seen, however, he relinquished these cynical principles in his old age, and enabled his pupil Erastosthenes to describe him as one who had dug a hole through the party-wall between pleasure and virtue.⁶ On the other hand, HERILLUS of Carthage, also a disciple of Zeno, fell back on Megarism, and maintained that science was the only end of life,⁷ though external advantages might appear as subordinate objects.⁸ With him dialectics was the main instrument of

turgemälde der ganzen Schule, und jeder spätere wahre Stoiker gleicht vorzüglich einem von diesen.'

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 161. He had a few followers, who were called 'Αριστώνειοι.

² *Epist.* XIV. 1, § 13.

³ Cic. *De Fin.* V. 25, § 73; cf. IV. § 40, espec. IV. 17, 47: 'explosa est Aristonis sententia dicentis nihil differre aliud ab alio, nec esse res ullas, præter virtutes et vitia, inter quas quidquam interesset.' This was his principle of ἀδιαφορία. See Sext. *Emp. adv. Math.* XI. 64, p. 703, Fabricius; and Suidas, s. v. τέλος.

⁴ Stobæus, *Sermon.* IV. 110.

⁵ Plut. *De Virtute Morali*, 2, p. 440 F: 'Αρίστων δὲ ὁ Χῖος τῇ μὲν οὐσίᾳ μίαν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπερὴν ἐποίησεν καὶ ὑγιειαν ὠνόμαξε. Cf. *De Stoicorum repugnantiis*, 7.

⁶ Athen. VII. p. 281 C.

⁷ Cicero, *De Fin.* II. 13, § 43; V. 25, § 73.

⁸ Cicero charges him with *duo sejuncta ultima bonorum* (*De Fin.* IV. 15, § 40), but he really distinguished between the main end and the subordinate object. Diog. Laërt. VII. 165 (repeated by Suidas, s. v. τέλος): διαφέρειν δὲ τέλος καὶ ὑποτελίδας· τῆς μὲν γὰρ καὶ τοὺς μὴ σοφοὺς στοχάζεσθαι, τοῦ δὲ μόνον τὸν σοφόν.

philosophy, and the theoretical life the most worthy object of man. Diogenes¹ gives us a long list of his writings, which he says consisted of only a few lines each, but were full of power (*ὀλιγόστιχα μὲν, δυνάμειος δὲ μεστά*).

These examples show that Zeno had not succeeded in forming a compact and lasting system, and it is probable that the Stoics would have been broken up into different parties, if their founder had not been represented by a man of firm character, who warmly espoused the main principles of Zeno. This was CLEANTHES, the new Hercules, as he was called,² a poor boxer, and a native of Assos in the Troad. It is not known when he was born, or when he first came to Athens. His poverty was so great, that in order to be able to spend his days in the pursuit of philosophy, he passed a part of the night in watering the gardens at Athens, whence he got the name of 'the drawer of water' (*φρεάντλης*).³ After spending eighteen years in the school of Zeno, he became his successor in the Porch. He adopted implicitly the principles of his master, and was called, or called himself, the pounding-mortar of arguments, who ventured on nothing original, and the ass of Zeno,⁴ who was both ready and able to bear any weight imposed upon him. His talents were not brilliant, but he retained what he learned the more durably on account of the difficulty with which he acquired it. At a very advanced age, he put an end to his life by voluntary starvation.⁵ We have a list of many writings by Cleanthes 'on the History of Philosophy,' 'on Rhetoric,' 'on Pleasure,' 'on Duty,' and similar subjects.⁶ These are represented only by a few fragments, but Stobæus has preserved his hymn to Jupiter, in hexameter verse, which has been much admired for the elevation of its sentiments, and for a flight of Stoic morality, which might

¹ VII. 165.

² *Id.* VII. 170.

³ *Id.* VII. 168.

⁴ *Id.* VII. 170: *ἦν δὲ πονικὸς μὲν, ἀφυῆς δὲ καὶ βραδὺς ὑπερβαλλόντως· διὸ καὶ Τίμων περὶ αὐτοῦ οὕτως·*

*τίς δ' οὗτος κτίλος ὥς ἐπιπωλεῖται στίχας ἀνδρῶν,
μωλύτης, ἐπέων λίθος Ἀσσιος, ἔλμος ἀτολμος;*

καὶ σκωπτόμενος δ' ὑπὸ τῶν συμμαθητῶν ἠνείχετο· καὶ ὄνος ἀκούων προσεδέχετο, λέγων αὐτὸς μόνος δύνασθαι βαστάζειν τὸ Ζήνωνος φέρτιον.

⁵ *Id.* VII. 176.

⁶ *Id.* VII. 175.

almost be adopted by a Christian.¹ His principles belonged to the best type of ancient ethics, and the Roman Stoics thought that the best training for the young was to implant in them the seeds of the Cleanthean doctrines.²

Zeno and Cleanthes had merely laid down the general principles of their philosophy. It was left to CHRYSIPPUS to systematize their doctrines, to give them a formal literary expression, and not only to defend them against all adverse criticism, but to maintain their superiority to rival systems, and to subject the contradictory hypothesis to controversial arguments of the most unsparing kind. 'Only give me your dogmas,' he often said to Cleanthes, 'I will furnish them with the necessary proofs.'³ The Stoic philosophy owed so much to his literary labours that the Porch would not have existed had it not been for Chrysippus.⁴ He was in fact the genuine archetype of the schoolmen in the middle ages. His logic was always in readiness, and he was able to go into the lists of argument at any moment.

Chrysippus was the son of Apollodorus, of Tarsus, in Cilicia, and was born B.C. 280, at Soli. He died at Athens B.C. 207,⁵ not by a voluntary death, like his two predecessors, but from an immoderate fit of laughter on seeing an ass eating some figs destined for his own supper. 'Give him a bumper of wine,' he cried to the old woman who attended him, and was so amused by the incident, that he sunk under the exhaustion of his own merriment.⁶ Chrysippus was not originally a disciple of the Stoic school. He had first applied himself to the doctrines of the Academy under Arcesilaus and Lacydes,⁷ and it is clear that he had bestowed a great deal of attention on the

¹ *Eclog. Phys.* tom. I. P. I. No. 12, p. 30, sqq. Heeren.

² *Pers.* V. 63 :

Cultor enim juvenum, purgatas inseris aures
Frugæ Cleanthæ.

³ *Diog. Laërt.* VII. p. 550 : πρὸς Κλεάνθην, ᾧ καὶ πολλάκις ἔλεγε, μόνῃς τῆς τῶν δογμάτων διδασκαλίας χρῆξεν, τὰς δὲ ἀποδείξεις αὐτὸν εὐρήσειν.

⁴ *Cic. Acad.* II. 24, § 75 : 'Chrysippus, qui fulcisse putatur Porticum Stoicorum.' *Diog. Laërt.* VII. 183 : εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν Χρύσιππος οὐκ ἂν ἦν στοά.

⁵ *Clinton, F. H.* III. p. 49.

⁶ *Diog. Laërt.* VII. 185 : θνὸν γὰρ τὰ σῦκα αὐτῷ φαγόντος εἰπόντα τῇ γράϊ 'δίδου νῦν ἄκρατον ἐπιβρόφῃσαι τῷ θνῷ,' ὑπερκαυχάσαντα τελευτήσαι.

⁷ *Id.* VII. 183, 184.

captious logic of the Megarians.¹ It is stated that he heard Zeno, and this is not impossible;² it is certain that he was a pupil of Cleanthes, from whom, however, as we have already mentioned, he adopted only the general principles of the school, which he undertook to support by arguments derived from other sources. In general it may be said that he was not an original philosopher in any sense of the term. 'If any one,' said Apollodorus,³ 'were to take from the books of Chrysippus all that he has borrowed from others, the paper would be left blank.' He was a man of great quickness and versatility, and, without creating any system, he was able to acquire existing knowledge to any extent,⁴ and to write with unexampled fluency on any subject that he had studied. Indeed, it may be said that he wrote for writing's sake. The old woman who attended upon him declared that he used to scribble 500 lines every day,⁵ and his separate writings amounted to the great number of 705.⁶ This *cacoethes scribendi* must have been attended by some disadvantageous results. His style was careless and slovenly;⁷ his writings abounded in repetitions, digressions into extraneous subjects, occasional vagueness, and not infrequent obscurity. He overloaded his pages with quotations from the poets, which served him instead of arguments.⁸ And Plutarch has written a treatise to expose the incongruities and self-contradictions of his arguments.⁹ The chief object of many of his treatises was polemical. His attacks were directed mainly against the Epicureans and the Academics. But he also

¹ Cic. *Acad.* II. 48, 147: 'Stoici soritem et ψευδόμενον plagas ipsi contra se texuerunt.'

² Zeno died B.C. 260—257, and therefore Chrysippus, who was born B.C. 280, might have been his disciple.

³ Diog. Laërt. VII. 181, p. 551: ἐι γάρ τις ἀφέλοι τῶν Χρυσίππου βιβλίων ὅσ' ἀλλότρια παρατεθείται, κενὸς αὐτῷ ὁ χάριτης καταλείψεται.

⁴ Cic. *Tusc.* I. 45, § 108; Athen. XIII. p. 565 A: χαίρω γὰρ πάνυ τῷ ἀνδρὶ διὰ τὴν πολυμαθίαν.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. VII. 181, on the authority of Diocles.

⁶ *Id.* VII. 180.

⁷ *Id. ibid.*: πλεονάσας δὲ τοῖς πράγμασι τὴν λέξιν οὐ κατέρρωσε.

⁸ He once quoted nearly the whole of the *Medea* of Euripides in one of his books, insomuch that a reader being asked what work he had in his hands, replied, 'Χρυσίππου Μήδειαν.' Diog. Laërt. VII. 180.

⁹ περὶ στωϊκῶν ἐναντιωμάτων, *De repugnantiis Stoicis*.

sought to controvert the opinions of Plato and Aristotle, for whom, however, he professed to entertain great respect.¹ Some of his writings had reference to the improvements in the nomenclature of grammar and logic, of which the Stoics generally have the credit.² To these speculations he was led by his study of the Megaric system of dialectics, and he paid particular attention to the seven captious syllogisms of Eubulides. On 'the liar' he wrote a commentary in six volumes,³ and he discussed the *sorites* so fully that the Stoic satirist calls it 'the heap of Chrysippus.'⁴ His logical dexterity, and the voluminous works which he wrote on the subject, have gained him a reputation as a dialectician, which more truly belongs to his predecessors. 'He was so famous as a reasoner,' says his biographer Diogenes,⁵ 'that most persons thought that if there was any occasion for dialectics among the gods, they must use the system of Chrysippus.' In spite of the drawbacks which we have mentioned, it must be a matter of regret that we do not possess one complete work by a writer who must, at any rate, have had great merit as an acute and intelligent expositor of the Stoical system, which we are obliged to learn at second-hand from the more modern representatives of the school.

The main object of the Stoics was to connect philosophy with the practical duties of common life; to insist on the necessity of virtue as a main ingredient in happiness; and to carry out to its fullest extent the Socratic identification of virtue and science. Maintaining the tripartite division of philosophy⁶

¹ Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* 24.

² For example, he wrote *περὶ τῶν ἑτυμολογικῶν, περὶ ὀρθῶν καὶ ὑπτίων, περὶ τῶν πέντε πτώσεων, περὶ τῶν ἐνικῶν καὶ πληθυντικῶν ἐκφορῶν* in six books, *περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰς λέξεις ἀνωμαλίας, περὶ σολοικιζόντων λόγων, περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν λεγομένων, περὶ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ λόγου* (Diog. Laërt. VII. 191—3).

³ See above, chapter XXXVII. § 4, p. 174 [14].

⁴ *Pers.* VI. 80:

Inventus, Chrysippe, tui finitor acervi.

⁵ VII. 180: οὕτω δ' ἐπίδοξος ἐν τοῖς διαλεκτικοῖς ἐγένετο ὥστε δοκεῖν τοὺς πλείους ὅτι εἰ παρὰ θεοῖς ἦν διαλεκτικὴ οὐκ ἂν ἄλλη ἦν ἢ ἡ Χρυσίππειος.

⁶ Plut. *De placitis philosophorum, Proæm.* p. 517, Wyttenb.: οἱ μὲν οὖν Στωϊκοὶ ἔφασαν τὴν μὲν σοφίαν εἶναι θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιστήμην· τὴν δὲ φιλοσοφίαν ἀσκησιν τέχνης ἐπιτηδεῖον· ἐπιτηδεῖον δ' εἶναι μίαν καὶ ἀνωτάτω, τὴν ἀρετὴν· ἀρετὰς δὲ τὰς γενικωτάτας τρεῖς, φυσικὴν, ἠθικὴν, λογικὴν· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν καὶ τριμέρης ἔστιν ἡ φιλοσοφία, κ. τ. λ.

into logic, ethics, and physics, they found a corresponding division of virtue.¹ And as virtue was at the same time essentially one, they showed that all these three parts of philosophy were necessarily connected with one another, and mutually dependent.² This they indicated by various comparisons: for example, logic was the shell, ethics the white, and physics the yolk of an egg; or logic represented the muscles and bones, ethics the flesh, and physics the soul of a living being; or logic represented the fence, ethics the fruit, and physics the earth and trees of a field bearing all sorts of produce.³ It may seem strange that, paying so much attention as they did to logic, they should thus degrade it to a merely ancillary position; but it must be remembered that though they confined reasoning to its merely organic or instrumental functions, they thus made it the basis of their whole system, or at least the means by which the system was to be maintained and propagated. In subordinating ethics to physics, they understood by the latter the search after the divine, or the true theology; and though moral duty, as the practical end of life, was the centre-point of their whole system, they saw that the human must be inferior to the divine, and that the philosophy of the latter must be the highest effort of speculation.⁴

In their *Logic*, especially in that of Chrysippus, the Stoics paid great attention to the subject of fallacies. Their chief literary service has been their improvements in the nomenclature of logic, with reference immediately to rhetoric and grammar. For the ten categories of Aristotle they substituted four—the subject or substratum (ὕποκείμενον), the kind of thing (ποτόν), the condition or state (πῶς ἔχον), and the special relation (πρὸς τί πως ἔχον):⁵ and from these they passed to the four parts of speech as they recognized them in the syntactical sentence or logical proposition—namely, the article, the noun, the verb, and the conjunction, in which Chrysippus admitted the further subdivision of the noun into

¹ *Id. ibid.*; Diog. Laërt. VII. 39; Cic. *De Fin.* III. 21, 22.

² Poseidonius, *apud Sext. Emp.* VII. 19; Diog. Laërt. VII. 40.

³ *Id. ibid.*

⁴ *Sext. Emp.* VII. 23; Seneca, *Nat. Quæst. Præf.*

⁵ Simplic. *Categ.* fol. 16 B: ποιοῦνται γὰρ τὴν τομὴν εἰς τέσσαρα· εἰς ὑποκείμενα καὶ ποιά καὶ πῶς ἔχοντα καὶ πρὸς τί πως ἔχοντα.

proper and common.¹ Three of these parts of speech, the noun, the verb, and the conjunction, had been acknowledged by Aristotle and Theodectes;² and in adding the article, the Stoics showed a profound appreciation of its logical importance.³ We owe to the Stoics a grammatical distinction of more general application than that of the parts of speech. Previously, the term 'case' (*casus*, *πτῶσις*, 'a falling') meant any form of a word, whether declinable or indeclinable, and even a form of sentence was denoted by this name.⁴ But the Stoics—probably first of all Chrysippus in his treatise 'on the five cases' (*περὶ τῶν πέντε πτώσεων*),—gave a new and ingenious application of the term, in the sense in which it is now so familiar to us. They regarded the nominative as a perpendicular (*πτῶσις ὀρθή*, or *εὐθεία*), from which the other cases deviated or fell away by increasing angles, and so became oblique cases (*πτῶσεις πλαγία*).⁵ From the titles of other treatises attributed to Chrysippus, we see that he must have discussed almost all the important details of grammar in its modern sense, and it can hardly be doubted that he is the author of our modern applications of the words 'case,' 'parts of speech,' 'syntax,' and 'etymology.'⁶

In the *Ethics* of the Stoics, the fundamental principle was that which they borrowed from Polemon,⁷ that man must live in unison with nature; and as our nature instinctively inclines to virtue, our duty and our happiness concur in the pursuit of that which is morally good.⁸ In this, of course he asserted the supremacy of the reason, or rather said that man existed only in the functions of his mind. Living, then, in conformity to nature, was living in conformity to the higher rational nature of man as such.⁹

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 57.: *ὄνομα, προσηγορία, ῥῆμα, σύνδεσμος, ἄρθρον*. Dion. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 2, p. 8, Reiske.

² Dionys. u. s. *De Demosth. præstantiâ*, p. 1101, Reiske; Quintil. I. 4, § 18.

³ *New Cratylus*, § 125.

⁴ Aristot. *Poet.* 20, 10; *Topica*, VI. 10, 1. For *πτῶσις* = *ὄνομα*, see Plutarch, *Quæstiones Platonicæ*, 1009 C, p. 108, Wytenb. ⁵ *New Cratylus*, § 227.

⁶ See the list of his grammatical works above, p. 29.

⁷ Above, p. 8.

⁸ Diog. Laërt. VII. 87: Ζήνων τέλος εἶπε τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν' ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν' ἀγχι γὰρ πρὸς ταύτην [ἡμᾶς] ἡ φύσις.

⁹ Stob. *Eclog.* II. p. 132: τὸ ὁμολογουμένως ζῆν' τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ καθ' ἕνα λόγον καὶ σύμφωνον ζῆν, ὡς τῶν μαχομένων ζώων κακοδαιμονούντων.

But though nothing according to the Stoics was good, except virtue, and the moral will which it implies, they did not altogether deny the value of external circumstances. Certain things, such as health, riches, intellectual acquirements, have a value of their own, and are admitted to be worthy (*ἀξια*); but the Stoics were careful to maintain that such things were not good in themselves, but only preferable alternatives (*προηγμένα*).¹ The philosopher, if he had a choice between riches and poverty, would prefer the former, and this too on grounds of reason; but these things have only a relative value, and cannot be regarded as constituents of that happiness, which depends entirely on moral volition and action. Without disregarding, therefore, these secondary considerations, the Stoic sage rises superior to them. He is free from all passions and unnatural emotions,² he alone is rich and a king, wise and a prophet,³ for he stands above all human imperfections, like a god moving in this lower world.⁴ The Stoics had their own subdivisions of virtue and a terminology for degrees of moral rectitude. They adopted the four cardinal virtues,⁵ which play such an important part in the philosophy of Plato, but they did not connect them, as he did, with any corresponding division of the soul, and would not allow that there was any virtue except in the deliberate choice of what was right by a perfectly wise man.⁶ They distinguished between the legality and the morality of actions; the former was befitting or appropriate (*καθῆκον*),⁷ but it was only midway between right and wrong (*μέσον*), between the essentially moral act (*κατόρθωμα*),⁸ and the violation of duty or sin

¹ Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* 30; Cic. *De Finibus* IV. 26, § 72; Diog. Laërt. VII. 105; Stob. *Ecl.* II. p. 144 sqq. p. 156: τὰ μὲν οὖν πολλὰν ἔχοντα ἀξίαν προηγμένα λέγεσθαι—προηγμένον δ' εἶναι λέγουσιν, δ, ἀδιάφορον δὲν, ἐκλεγόμεθα κατὰ προηγούμενον λόγον.—τὸ δὲ προηγμένον τὴν δευτέραν χώραν καὶ ἀξίαν ἔχον συνεγγίξειν πῶς τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν φύσει.

² Stob. *Ecl.* II. p. 166; Diog. Laërt. VII. 110; Cic. *De Fin.* III. 10.

³ Stob. *Ecl.* II. pp. 122, 172, 204; Cic. *Acad.* I. 10; II. 44, *De Div.* II. 63, § 129.

⁴ Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* 13; *Adv. Stoicos*, 33.

⁵ Stob. *Ecl.* II. pp. 108, 112; Diog. Laërt. VII. 126.

⁶ Stob. *Ecl.* II. pp. 116, 120, 198.

⁷ *Id.* II. p. 158; Diog. Laërt. VII. 107, 108, 110; Cicero, *De Finibus*, III. 6.

⁸ Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* II.; Stob. *Ecl.* II. 184, 192, 220; Cicero, *De Finibus*, III. 18.

(ἀμάρτημα), unless it was unconditionally right, according to the principles of moral duty.¹

The *Physics* of the Stoics rested partly on the system of Heracleitus. Recognizing a sort of vitality in fire, they claimed for this element a creative mundane force, which by a fixed law produced and again destroyed at certain intervals.² Fire then was not merely an instrument in the hand of a Prometheus, but was the artist himself (τεχνικὸν πῦρ),³ in other words, it represented the deity; so that God was little more than the seed or first element of things, which were created according to a law of impregnation (σπερματικὸς λόγος).⁴ Adopting formally the old polytheism of the Greeks, the Stoics either assigned to the different gods a place in the elemental world, by identifying them with certain natural objects or visible phenomena—such as the heavenly bodies, and the changes of the seasons—or made them the deifications of illustrious men, the benefactors of their race.⁵ Thus, however, they considered them only as manifestations of the one primary power of creative fire.⁶ To the same source ultimately they referred the souls of men, which were parts of the universal soul, and as such would continue to subsist after death. They did not, like Plato and Aristotle, distinguish between the rational and irrational elements of the soul, but considered all the senses, with certain bodily organs, as functions of the intellect (διάνοια), which they placed, as a ruling principle (ἡγεμονικόν), in the heart of man.⁷ With them both the will (θυμὸς) and the passions (ἐπιθυμίαι) were but corrupted or fallen representatives of the reason (λόγος).⁸ And as every special nature was, according to them, derived from the universal nature; this view of the connexion of the soul of man in all its parts with the informing principle of the world, was necessarily the foundation of the Stoical law of ethics that man should live

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 109.

² Stob. *Ecl.* I. p. 414.

³ Diog. Laërt. VII. 137, 148, 156.

⁴ *Id.* VII. 136; Plut. *De placitis philos.* 1, 7; Cleanthes, *apud Stob. Ecl.* I. p. 372.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. VII. 147.

⁶ Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* 38; Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* I. 14, 15; II. 23.

⁷ Sext. Emp. IX. 102; Galen, *De Hippocr. et Plat. plac.* II. pp. 89, 91, 98, 99.

⁸ Galen, u. s. IV. pp. 135, 139, 147, 155.

agreeably to his true nature, which is that of the universe. In their religious application, the physical theories of the Stoics connected themselves especially with certain views respecting providence and predestination.¹ Fatalism is a necessary consequence of pantheism, and as the Stoics considered the world as inter-penetrated by active divinity, they held that there was no act or occurrence, however trivial, which was not ordered and regulated by the providence of the supreme governor of the universe. To his overruling power we must submit whether we will it or not; and though the Stoics made an effort to plead for the free agency of man in a certain sense, and though their idea of providence (*πρόνοια*) did not always presume a fixed object on the part of the Deity, it became identified in the case of individuals and nations with destiny, which they denoted by a poetical term (*εἰμαρμένη*) borrowed from Heraclitus. And in this way they incurred the reproach, which is justly brought against materialism.²

These doctrines of the Stoics were maintained with a diminished force and consistency by the successors of Chrysippus. He was followed by DIOGENES of SELEUCIA, commonly called the *Babylonian*, and by ZENO of TARSUS; ANTIPATER of Tarsus, and ARCHIDEMUS, were pupils of Diogenes; PANÆTIUS of Rhodes was the scholar and successor of Antipater, and his most distinguished disciple was POSEIDONIUS of Apamea.

In the earliest of these teachers we see a departure from the fundamental principles of the old Stoicism. Zeno of Tarsus gave up the theory of a production and destruction by means of fire,³ and Diogenes and Antipater departed from the strict distinction between the good and the preferable.⁴

PANÆTIUS, who exercised a great influence over distinguished Romans, like Scipio and Lælius, not only gave up the fire-theory,⁵ but even relinquished the Stoic hypothesis, that the bodily organs were functions of the soul.⁶ The moral philo-

¹ Ritter, *Hist. of Philosophy*, III. pp. 554 sqq.

² See Schleiermacher, *Gesch. d. Philos.* p. 129; and compare Renouvier, *Manuel de Philosophie Ancienne*, II. pp. 246, 251, 263, 283.

³ Numenius *ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev.* XV. 18, ad fin. p. 820 D.

⁴ Stob. *Eclog.* II. p. 134.

⁵ Cic. *De Naturâ Deorum*, II. 46, § 118.

⁶ Nemesius, *De Naturâ Hominis*, c. 15, p. 96; Tertullian, *De Animâ*, c. 14.

sophy of his book, 'on the becoming' (περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος), which is expounded by Cicero in his treatise 'on duties' (*De Officiis*),¹ blends the principles of the Stoics with those of Plato, Xenocrates, Theophrastus, and Dicæarchus, and was adopted by Cicero on account of its general and practical character, and its freedom from the dogmatic theories of a particular school.² In his grammatical labours, in which he had the works of Chrysippus to guide him, Panætius followed also the teaching of his own tutor, Crates of Mallus.³ Besides his regard for the works of Plato, whom he called the Homer of philosophy,⁴ Panætius showed an eclectic spirit in his commendation of Crantor,⁵ and he can hardly be regarded as a pure representative of the Porch.

POSEIDONIUS, who counted among his pupils the eminent Romans, Cicero and Pompey,⁶ was a literary man of very varied excellence.⁷ In many respects he followed in the steps of the great Eratosthenes. Like him he investigated physical geography, and made some important contributions to this subject.⁸ He wrote a general or miscellaneous history in about fifty books, extending from 146 B.C. to 96 B.C., and therefore in continuation of Polybius;⁹ a treatise on natural philosophy (φυσικὸς λόγος) in fifteen books;¹⁰ an essay on the gods, in thirteen books,¹¹ besides a disquisition 'on the becoming' (περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος), which his pupil Cicero combined with the work of Panætius in his book *De Officiis*;¹² a

¹ Cic. *ad Attic.* XVI. 11, § 4: 'Quod de inscriptione quæris, non dubito quin καθήκον officium sit, nisi quid tu aliud: sed inscriptio plenior de officiis. Προσφωνῶ autem Ciceroni filio.' Cf. *De Officiis*, III. 2, § 7, &c.

² Cic. *De Offic.* II. 10, § 35; *De Fin.* IV. 28, § 79.

³ Strabo, XIV. p. 676; Van Lynden, *Disputatio Historico-Critica de Panætio Rhodio*, pp. 66 sq.

⁴ Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* I. 32, § 79.

⁵ *Acad.* II. 44, § 135: 'legimus omnes Crantoris de luctu. Est enim non magnus verum aureolus et, ut Tuberoni Panætius præcipit, ad verbum ediscendus libellus.'

⁶ Cic. *De Nat. Deorum*, I. 3; *ad Att.* II. 1, § 2; Strabo, XI. p. 492; Cic. *Tusc.* II. 25, § 61; Plin. *H. N.* VII. 31.

⁷ Strabo, XVI. p. 753: ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφούντων πολυμαθέστατος.

⁸ Strabo, II. p. 119, &c.; see Bake, *Posidonii reliquiae doctrinae*, pp. 87 sqq. pp. 133 sqq.; pp. 178 sqq.

⁹ Athen. IV. p. 168 D.

¹¹ *Id.* VII. 138.

¹⁰ Diog. Laërt. VII. 140.

¹² Cic. *ad Att.* XVI. § 11.

book on the magnitude of the sun,¹ and numerous other works on meteorology,² natural philosophy, and ethics, including a commentary on the *Timæus* of Plato.³ Although Poseidonius made the Stoics' system of ethics the basis of his own, he endeavoured to reconcile their views with those of other philosophers. He seems to have had a comprehensive mind, which is tolerant of minor differences, and dwells rather on essential points of agreement. And thus, while he relinquished the characteristic principle of the Stoics, that virtue was sufficient for happiness, and returned to Plato's division of the soul into its three elements—the reason, the will, and the appetite⁴—while he recognized what was good in Democritus,⁵ and revived the Pythagorean system of numbers,⁶ he was contributing to relieve philosophy of its sectarian character, and to give it a broader basis in the common sympathies of men.

The Stoics alone can be mentioned by the side of the great philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, as having constituted a distinctive form of speculation. It has been well remarked by a historian of philosophy⁷ that Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics represent three different periods in the life of man. Plato exhibits the character of eager and imaginative youth, who lives rather in the future than the present; Aristotle is the sober and manly mind, which applies itself to the actuality of the present; and the Stoic is the septuagenarian, who feels himself out of his place in the world as it is, and appears as the admirer of the past and as the despiser of his contemporaries. He insists on a rigorous morality, and places his sage in an unattainable position, as if his wish was to contrast his ideal with the miserable deficiencies of actual life. It is not at all surprising that such a system should be but shortlived in its genuine form, and should gradually submit to modifications which

¹ Cleomedes, *Cycl. Theor.* II. p. 430 sqq.

² Diog. Laërt. VII. 144, quotes from the seventh book of Poseidonius *περὶ μετεώρων*.

³ Sext. Empir. *adv. Math.* VII. 93.

⁴ Galen, *De Hipp. et Plat. plac.* VIII. p. 319.

⁵ Seneca, *Epist.* 94.

⁶ Sext. Empir. VII. 93; Theo. Smyrn. *De Mus.* 46, p. 162; Galen, *l. c.* V. p. 171; Plut. *De Procr. Anim.* 22.

⁷ H. Ritter, *History of Ancient Philosophy*, vol. III. pp. 640 sqq. Engl. Tr.

brought it nearer to the other schools. And we find that the later representatives of the Stoic school adopted an eclecticism which was influenced partly by the last and most superficial of these Athenian sects, the new Academy, which we now proceed to notice.

§ 8. The old Academy, as it was constituted by Crantor, passed through several successive phases of doctrine, which are generally known as the middle Academy of Arcesilaus, the new Academy of Carneades, the fourth Academy of Philo, and the fifth Academy of Antiochus. This subdivision is hardly merited by the importance and individual distinctness of the doctrines propounded, and it is perhaps sufficient to class the fourth and fifth modifications under the new Academy from which they emanated.

The great change in the teaching of the Academy, which led to the others, was made by ARCESILAUS of Pitane, in Æolis, who was nearly a contemporary of Epicurus and Zeno. He was born Ol. 116, I. B.C. 316.¹ His education was commenced at Pitane and Sardis by Autolycus the mathematician.² Having visited Athens, while still young, with a view to the study of rhetoric, he became a pupil first of Theophrastus, and then of Crantor, and probably also of Polemon.³ With their teaching he combined an attendance on the lectures of Pyrrhon the sceptic, and Diodorus the Megarian, and a line of Ariston of Chios is quoted in which he is described, like the Chimæra, as three in one—‘Plato in front, behind Pyrrhon, in the midst Diodorus.’⁴ He succeeded to the presidency of the Academy on the death of Crantor,⁵ and while he abstained from writing, and endeavoured to revive the Socratic method of question and answer,⁶ he introduced into his teaching many elements derived from the other schools, in which he had received a part of his training, and even revived some of the obsolete theories of Parmenides and Heracleitus, which he endeavoured to harmonize.⁷ He was patronized by the kings of Pergamus, Attalus and Eumenes,

¹ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 367 h.

² Diog. Laërt. IV. 29.

³ *Id. ibid.* Numenius, *apud Euseb. Præp. Ev.* XIV. 5; Cic. *Acad.* I. 9, § 55; *De Oratore*, III. 18, 67.

⁴ Diog. Laërt. IV. 33, p. 275 B:

πρόσθε Πλάτων, ὀπίθεν Πύρρων, μέσσος Διόδωρος.

⁵ *Id.* IV. 32: Κράτητος δὲ ἐκλιπόντος κάτεσχε τὴν σχολήν, ἐκχωρήσαντος αὐτῷ Σωκρατίδου τινός.

⁶ *Id.* IV. 28.

⁷ Plut. *adv. Colot.* 26.

and affected the character, if not of a courtier, at least of a man of the world.¹ And his death, at the age of seventy-six, is attributed to a fit of drunkenness.² His successor, LACYDES of Cyrene, transferred the school of the Academy to a neighbouring garden belonging to king Attalus Philometor, called after him the *Lacydeum*, and it is said that the new Academy originally got its name from this change of locality.³ But it does not seem that Lacydes, or his successors TELECLES and EVANDER, or HEGESINUS, who followed the latter, introduced any important modifications of the teaching of Arcesilaus. The new Academy, if it is to refer to a change in the teaching, began with CARNEADES of Cyrene, who was born about Ol. 141, 4. B.C. 213,⁴ and was instructed in the academic philosophy by Hegesinus.⁵ He had also studied under Diogenes the Babylonian, and had mastered the logic of Chrysippus.⁶ When therefore he was chosen to preside in the Academy, and found himself thus the leader in the controversy with the Stoics, he felt that he was fighting them with their own weapons, and often expressed this feeling in the line—

‘I should not be had not Chrysippus been.’⁷

His mastery of logic was assisted by considerable powers as an orator, and he gained so much reputation by his eloquence that he was selected, along with Diogenes the Stoic and Critolaus the Peripatetic, to go as ambassador to Rome in B.C. 155, and endeavour to get the Senate to remit a fine of five hundred talents imposed on Athens for the destruction of Oropus.⁸ We are told⁹ that Rutilius and Polybius admired the eloquence which was peculiar to each philosopher—that the oratory of Carneades was strong and rapid, that of Critolaus learned and polished, and that of Diogenes modest and temperate. The

¹ Diog. Laërt. IV. 40.

² *Id.* IV. 44.

³ Diog. Laërt. IV. 59, 60: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τῆς νέας Ἀκαδημίας κατάρξας . . . ὁ γοῦν Λακύνδης ἐσχόλαζεν ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ ἐν τῷ κατεσκευασθέντι κήπῳ ὑπὸ Ἀττάλου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ Λακύνδειον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ προσηγορεύετο.

⁴ *Id.* IV. 65.

⁵ Cic. *Acad.* II. 6, § 16.

⁶ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* XIV. 7; Cic. *Acad.* II. 27, § 87; 30, § 98.

⁷ Diog. Laërt. IV. 62: εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν Χρύσιππος οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἐγώ. This is a parody of the line on Chrysippus; see above, p. 27.

⁸ Cic. *Tusc.* IV. 3, § 5; *ad Att.* XII. 23, § 2; *De Orat.* II. 37.

⁹ Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* VII. 14.

Romans could only hear their arguments at second-hand through their interpreter, C. Acilius; but the subject of two speeches delivered by Carneades for and against justice was made known to Cato the Censor, and he recommended the Senate to dismiss the ambassadors on some decent pretext (μετ' εὐπρεπείας), lest the youth of Rome should be corrupted by such principles, and drawn away from their military pursuits to the frivolities of Greek literature.¹ Carneades returned to Athens, where he died in B.C. 129.² Although he was so devoted to his studies that he neglected his person and forgot his meals,³ he committed nothing to writing, and his philosophical system appeared in Greek literature only in the works of his pupil and successor CLEITOMACHUS, from whom Cicero derived his information respecting the new Academy.⁴ Cleitomachus, whose original name was Hasdrubal,⁵ was born at Carthage. He was forty years old when he came to Athens;⁶ he was there before the year B.C. 146, when Carthage was destroyed;⁷ he was still teaching in B.C. 111, when Crassus heard him at Athens;⁸ and he was growing an old man when Carneades died in B.C. 129.⁹ He was intimate with the poet Lucilius, who died at the age of forty-five in B.C. 103, and to whom he could not have dedicated a work¹⁰ till the Satirist had become famous—*i. e.* towards the end of his life. He also dedicated a book to a much older man, L. Marcus Censorinus,¹¹ who was consul in B.C. 149, and censor in B.C. 147. From these data, it may be inferred that Cleitomachus was born near the beginning and died towards the end of the second century B.C. He was a voluminous writer, having published some four hundred separate tracts or treatises,¹² in which his main object was to expound and enforce the doctrines of Carneades. He had written also a consolation addressed to his countrymen on the destruction of Carthage,¹³ to which catastrophe his friend Censorinus had con-

¹ Plutarch, *Cato Major*, c. 22.

² Cic. *Acad.* II. 6; Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 117.

⁴ *Acad.* II. 24, § 78; *Tusc.* V. 37, § 107.

⁶ *Id. ibid.*

⁸ *De Orat.* I. 18.

¹⁰ Cic. *Acad.* II. 32, § 102.

¹² Diog. Laërt. IV. 67: ὑπὲρ τὰ τετρακόσια βιβλία συνέγραψε. Cf. Cic. *Acad.*

II. 6, § 16.

³ Diog. Laërt. IV. 62.

⁵ Diog. Laërt. IV. 67.

⁷ Cic. *Tusc.* III. 22.

⁹ Cic. *Acad.* IV. 31.

¹¹ *Id. ibid.*

¹³ Cic. *Tusc.* III. 22, § 54.

tributed; and he had drawn up a history of the different sects of philosophers.¹ Cicero speaks in very high terms of his literary merits.²

Of the doctrines of PHILO of Larissa, who is considered as the head of a fourth Academy, we know very little. He was a pupil of Cleitomachus, and removed from Athens to Rome after the taking of the former city in the Mithridatic war. Here he established a school of philosophy and rhetoric, and counted Cicero among others as his disciple.³ As he denied that there was any difference between the old and new Academy,⁴ we must suppose that the tendency of his teaching was to establish a revival of the old Platonic doctrines so far as he understood them. On the other hand, Philo's scholar ANTIOCHUS of Ascalon, who is called the founder of a fifth Academy, endeavoured to reconcile his master's system with that of the Stoics.⁵ Indeed he is supposed to have adopted the principles of the later Stoicism, and to have introduced the Porch into the Academy.⁶ In this way he found himself running in a parallel line with the later Stoics, such as Panætius. Cicero had spent six months with him at Athens, where he had a school, in B.C. 79.⁷ He had also taught at Alexandria, and in Syria, where he died.⁸ He was as often in direct opposition to Philo as in agreement with him.⁹ Cicero seems to class him with the Stoics;¹⁰ and, at the best, we must regard him as an eclectic philosopher, rather than as a continuer or reviver of any doctrines peculiar to the Academy.¹¹

¹ Diog. Laërt. II. 92 : Κλειτόμαχος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ αἰρεσέων.

² Cic. *Acad.* II. 31, § 98 ; 6, § 31.

³ Stob. *Ecl.* II. p. 38 ; *Brut.* 89, § 306 ; *Tusc.* II. 3, § 9.

⁴ *Acad.* I. 4, § 13 : 'Philo, Antiochi magister, magnus vir, negat in libris, quod coram etiam ex ipso audiebamur, duas academias esse, erroremque eorum, qui ita putarunt, coarguit.'

⁵ Cic. *Acad.* I. 4, § 13 ; II. 19, 21, 22 ; Numenius, *apud Euseb. Præp. Ev.* XIV. 9.

⁶ Cic. *Acad.* II. 43, § 132 : 'appellabatur Academicus; erat quidem, si perpauca mutavisset, germanissimus Stoicus.' Cf. 46, § 143 : 'Antiochus a Chrysippo pedem nunquam' (discedit).

⁷ *Brutus*, 91, § 305.

⁸ Plut. *Lucull.* 42.

⁹ *Acad.* II. 4, 12 ; 6, § 18 ; 34, § 109, § 111.

¹⁰ *Acad.* II. 30, § 97.

¹¹ Besides the book written against Philo and entitled *Sosus*, Antiochus con-

In giving a brief sketch of this development of Athenian philosophy we may confine ourselves to the opinions of Arcesilaus and Carneades, neglecting the reactionary or fusionist schemes of Philo and Antiochus. The object, which the philosophers of the middle and new Academy generally proposed to themselves, was to find some mean between the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists, in which Arcesilaus had been instructed, and the positive logic of the Stoics, with which both Arcesilaus and Carneades waged a perpetual controversy. Reverting to the distinction between sensuous and intellectual knowledge, between opinion and science, which is so fully discussed in the *Theætetus* of Plato, the Stoics had endeavoured to mediate between the opposite views by imagining a middle term, which they called 'a convincing conception' (*φαντασία καταληπτική*).¹ Both Arcesilaus and Carneades denied the possibility of arriving at certainty or perfect conviction. The former proved, by arguments chiefly derived from the Socratic dialogues, that neither the senses nor the reason was a reliable criterion. But he went farther than Socrates, who professed that he knew at least his own ignorance; for Arcesilaus said that he knew nothing, not even that which Socrates maintained that he knew.² As for the 'convincing conception' of the Stoics, he regarded that as the mere interpolation of a term, which involved the opposition between opinion and science, and so contradicted itself.³ In theory, then, there is only a slight difference between Arcesilaus and the Pyrrhonians. And Timon the Sillographer said of Arcesilaus, that he carried in his breast

posed a treatise on logic, which he called by the Epicurean title 'Canonic' (Sext. Empir. VII. 201).

¹ Diog. Laërt. VII. 46: τῆς δὲ φαντασίας τὴν μὲν καταληπτικὴν, τὴν δὲ ἀκατάληπτον. καταληπτικὴν μὲν, ἣν κριτήριον εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων φασί, κ.τ.λ. According to Zeno the mere conception (*φαντασία*, *εμφασις*, *visum*) corresponded to the open hand, the assent of the mind (*συγκατάθεσις*, *assensus*), to the fingers slightly contracted (*quum paululum digitos constrinxerat*), and firm conviction (*κατάληψις*, *comprehensio*), to the closely doubled fist (*quum plane compresserat, pugnumque fecerat*). See Cic. *Acad.* II. 47, § 145. Zeno made a similar distinction between logic and rhetoric, Sext. Empiricus, II. 7.

² Cic. *Acad. Post.* I. 12, § 45: 'Itaque Arcesilaus negabat esse quidquam quod sciri posset, ne illud quidem ipsum, quod Socrates sibi reliquisset; sic omnia latere in occulto.'

³ Sextus Empir. VII. 150, 151; Cic. *Acad.* II. 24, § 77.

the lead of Menedemus, or the flesh of Pyrrhon or Diodorus, and made him declare that he would swim away towards Pyrrhon on the tortuous Diodorus.¹ But although Arcesilaus agreed with the sceptics in theory, he did not carry that theory into practice. He could not admit that the end of life was accomplished in that perfect equanimity and suspense (ἐποχή) which they regarded as the only condition worthy of a philosopher. This would have been to cast off all the bonds which connect man with practical life. On the contrary Arcesilaus insisted that a man must regulate his life by the natural affections of the human heart and the laws and customs of the country in which he happened to live: but he maintained at the same time that in doing this he must not believe that he is guided by fixed and certain and unalterable principles.² It is not at all unlikely that, in his case as in that of Pyrrhon, this one-sidedness arose from an exaggeration of the negative arguments of Plato. If, as is most likely, he made the *Theætetus* his manual, he would find there an elaborate and convincing demonstration of what science is *not*; but no full or detailed exposition of its certain criteria. It seems, then, that he attached such a high definition to science that it appeared to him unattainable: he therefore substituted probability for certainty, and acquiesced in that moral reasoning, which, without rising to the rank of demonstration, is the ordinary guide of life.³ The opinions of Carneades were merely an extension of these views. He, too, maintained the impossibility of finding a criterion of truth and certainty. Had there been one, it must have been found in sensation (αἴσθησις), conception (φαντασία), or reason (λόγος).

¹ Diog. Laërt. IV. 33, p. 275 C:

τῇ γὰρ ἔχων Μενέδημος ὑπὸ στέρνοισι μόνυβδον
θήσεται, ἢ Πύρρωνα τὸ πᾶν κρέας, ἢ Διόδωρον·

καὶ διαλιπὼν αὐτὸν ποιεῖ λέγοντα·

νήξομαι εἰς Πύρρωνα ἢ εἰς σκόλιον Διόδωρον.

² Sext. Empir. VII. 158; *Hypotyp. Pyrrhon.* I. 3, 226, 233; Aulus Gellius, N. A. XI. 5.

³ Ritter says (III. p. 607): 'his doubts as to the possibility of arriving at a knowledge of the truth may probably have had no other source than a high idea of science, derived, perhaps, from his study of Plato's works, and compared with which all human thought may have appeared at best but a probable conjecture.'

But the reason is deduced from the conception, and conception cannot exist without the irrational sensation.¹ So that the highest criterion of knowledge falls back on that which Plato had proved to be no criterion at all. In this, as in other points, Carneades had a direct controversial reference to Chrysippus; for he corrected the Stoic distinction between perception as in the subject and as in the object, probably by a reference to the opinions of Plato on the subject, and by showing that both subject and object must concur in every perception.² He also ridiculed the argument of the *Sorites*, by which Chrysippus had sought to extort concessions favourable to his views.³ But although Carneades thus denied the possibility of finding any criterion of absolute truth and certainty, he made the most of the argument from probability (τὸ εὐλογον), which even the Stoics had virtually admitted and which Arcesilaus had fully allowed.⁴ His theory of probability started from the distinction between perception as in the subject and as in the object, on which the Stoic doctrine of 'a convincing conception' must have depended. According to this distinction,⁵ 'every conception must have two relations (σχέσεις), one to the object, the other to the subject. With regard to the former, it is either true or false. And it is true, when it accords with the object conceived; but false when it is discordant. With regard to the subject, there is the apparently true, and that which does not so appear. The former was called by the Academics the appearance (ἐμφασις), probability (πιθανότης), and probable conception (πιθανὴ φαντασία); the latter was called non-appearance (ἀπέμφασις), improbable (ἀπειθής), and improbable conception

¹ Sextus Empir. VII. 165: ἡ κοινὴ τούτων φαντασία οὐκ ἔστι καταληπτικὴ, μὴ οὐσα δὲ καταληπτικὴ οὐδὲ κριτήριον ἔσται, μηδεμίᾳ δὲ οὐσης φαντασίας κριτικῆς οὐδὲ λόγος ἂν εἴη κριτήριον. ἀπὸ φαντασίας γὰρ οὗτος ἀνάγεται, καὶ εἰκότως. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ δεῖ φανῆναι αὐτῷ τὸ κρινόμενον, φανῆναι δὲ οὐδὲν δύναται χωρὶς τῆς ἀλόγου αἰσθήσεως. οὔτε οὖν ἡ ἀλογος αἰσθησις οὔτε ὁ λόγος ἦν κριτήριον.

² Compare the opinions attributed to Carneades (Sext. Empir. VII. 160: ἡ αἰσθησις ἀκίνητος μένουσα καὶ ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἄτρεπτος οὔτε αἰσθησίς ἐστιν οὔτε ἀντιληπτικὴ τινος), with the words of Plato, *Theætetus*, 156 D, sq.

³ Cic. *Academ.* II. 29, § 92 sqq.

⁴ Sext. Empir. VII. 158, where Fabricius remarks: 'hâc in parte non longe abfuit Arcesilaus a Stoicorum sententiâ; nam et illi τὸ καθήκον (apud Laërtium, VII. 107, Stobæum ac Suidam), definiunt τὸ ἀκόλουθον ἐν ζῳῃ δὲ πραχθὲν εὐλογον ἀπολογίαν ἔχει.

⁵ Sext. Empir. VII. 168.

(ἀπίθανος φαντασία). For neither that which appears false of itself, nor that which is true but does not appear to us, has any power of persuasion.' But this probability, as a guide of life, was a question of degree. And the highest degree of probability was (I), when the perception, on which the conception rested, was generally true, *i.e.* not dependent on changes in the relation between the subject and object,¹ (II), when it is never contradicted by other contemporaneous perceptions,² and (III), when, finally, it has been thoroughly investigated, sifted, and traced to its origin,³ in other words when the perception was not only true in itself, but also not drawn aside by other perceptions (ἀπερίσπαστος) with which it is linked together, and when it is examined in all its parts (διεξωδευμένη, περιωδευμένη). 'In things of slight moment,' said Carneades,⁴ 'we use as our criterion the probable conception alone; in those of importance, that which is not distracted or drawn aside by others; but in things pertaining to our happiness that which has been examined in all its parts.' If we test these views of Carneades we shall see that they have no value except that which Cicero attributes to them, namely, as furnishing the best basis for rhetorical argumentation. 'I have always,' says the Roman orator,⁵ 'approved of the practice of the Academy of disputing for and against every opinion, not only because it is the only means of ascertaining probability, but also because it furnishes the best practice in oratory.' 'I must confess,' he remarks in another passage,⁶ 'that I have become an orator, if I am one, or of whatever kind I am, not from the mechanical and technical schools of the rhetoricians, but from the wider and more comprehensive teaching of the Academy.' And he admits that he makes use of this philosophy in preference to others, because it

¹ Sext. Empir. VII. 173: ἡ φαινόμενη ἀληθὴς καὶ ἱκανῶς ἐμφαινόμενη κριτήριόν ἐστι τῆς ἀληθείας κατὰ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Καρνεάδην.

² *Id.* VII. 176: ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐδέποτε φαντασία μονοειδὴς ὑφίσταται ἀλλ' ἀλύσειws τρόπον ἄλλη ἐξ ἄλλης ἤρτηται, δεύτερον προσγενήσεται κριτήριον ἢ πιθανὴ ἅμα καὶ ἀπερίσπαστος φαντασία.

³ *Id.* VII. 182: ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν περιωδευμένην συνδρομὴν ἐκάστην τῶν ἐν τῇ συνδρομῇ ἐπιστατικῶς δοκιμάζομεν.

⁴ *Id.* VII. 184.

⁵ *Tuscul. Disp.* II. 3; cf. Quintil. *I. O.* XII. 2.

⁶ *Orator.* 4, 12.

is the parent of oratorical topics.¹ There can be little doubt that Carneades himself, and perhaps Arcesilaus before him, must have had some such object in their investigation of the laws of probability. They were both of them eminent as orators, and, as we have seen, Carneades had distinguished himself like a true sophist of the olden time, when he spoke at Rome with equal force both for and against justice. Aristotle had shown how important a part of the philosophy of rhetoric was included in the theory of the probable; and in preferring ethics to physics, and laying himself out for the composition of discourses in which the argument from probability was made applicable to both sides of a question, Carneades tacitly admits that his tendency was rather to aim at victory in disputation than to labour for the establishment of truth.² And the whole of his opposition to Chrysippus, by means of weapons borrowed from the armoury of the Stoical logic, betrays the same inclination of his mind.

¹ *Paradoxa, Proœm.* 2 : 'nos eâ philosophiâ plus utimur, quæ peperit dicendi copiam, et in quâ dicuntur ea, quæ non multum discrepant ab opinione populari.'

² See Ritter, III. p. 619.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

CULTIVATION OF THE THEORY OF RHETORIC.

§ 1. Rapid decline of Greek oratory. Demetrius the Phalerian, and Cineas. § 2. Oratory becomes scholastic. § 3. Rhodian and Asiatic schools. § 4. Rhetorical theories.

§ 1. **T**HE rhetorical tendencies of the last school of philosophy lead us, by a natural transition, to consider the special and theoretical cultivation of the art of speaking during the period to which we have more especially referred in the last three chapters.

From the time when Aristotle published his excellent treatise on the philosophy of rhetoric, oratory, or public speaking, in the proper sense of the term, declined rapidly among the Greeks. The last of the great orators were contemporaries of the head of the Lyceum, and the Peripatetic DEMETRIUS of PHALERUM, who under the Macedonian influence, ruled Athens from Ol. 115, 4. B.C. 317, to Ol. 118, 2. B.C. 307, no longer represented the elevated character, the simple diction, the noble sentiments, the straightforward argumentation, which distinguished those who spoke in the ecclesia or law courts, while Athens was still free. 'He was,' says Cicero,¹ 'the most learned and polished of his class, but he was trained rather in the school of exercises than on the battle-field; he pleased rather than excited the men of Athens; for he had come forth to the bustle of the forum, not as from a military camp, but as from the study of Theophrastus; he was the first to give a weaker form to oratory, and preferred his own sweetness to the weight and dignity of his predecessors.' His style was sedate and placid, but florid and full of ornaments,² and, like the stars in the canopy of heaven, metaphors and allegories (*translata verba*), and above all metonyms, or the substitution of allusive words

¹ *Brutus*, 9, § 37, 38, cf. *De Orat.* II. 23, Quintil. XI. 33.

² Cic. *Brutus*, LXXXII. 285.

(*immutata verba*), glittered in his diction, and at once embellished and illustrated his meaning.¹ But he still retained the genuine characteristics of the Attic diction,² and while, as Quintilian says, he was the first to pave the way for a feeble style of declamation, he was the last who deserved to be classed with the older orators of Athens.³

Another orator, who was not an Athenian, seems to have preserved his style of speaking from those symptoms of declining power, which were conspicuous even in Demetrius. This was CINEAS the Thessalian, who is so well known as the court-philosopher and friend of Pyrrhus. In his early days he had been the scholar of Demosthenes, whom he resembled in his style of speaking. He had become acquainted with the philosophy of Epicurus, but it does not at all appear that he belonged to the Garden.⁴ His taste was for practical and even military life. He wrote or compiled a treatise on tactics,⁵ and was so useful to Pyrrhus, to whom he had attached himself, that the king used to say of him that he had gained more cities by the eloquence of Cineas than his own arms had conquered.⁶ The most famous incidents in his life were his embassies to Rome, in B.C. 280 and 278. On the first occasion his powers of persuasion were frustrated by an appeal from Appius Claudius Cæcus;⁷ on the second he succeeded in making an arrangement. He probably died during the king's expedition to Sicily: 'from that

¹ *Orator*. 27, § 92: 'Phalereus Demetrius, cujus oratio cum sedate placideque labitur, tum illustant eam quasi stellæ quædam translata verba atque immutata. § 94: 'hæc frequentat Phalereus maxime, suntque apud eum dulcissima, et quanquam translatio est apud eum multa, tamen immutationes nusquam crebriores.'

² *Cic. Brutus* u. s.: 'in quo etiam illud quæro, Phalereus ille Demetrius Atticene dixerit? Mihi quidem ex illius orationibus redolere ipsæ Athenæ videntur.'

³ *Quintil. I. O. X.* 1 § 80: 'quanquam is primus inclinasse orationem dicitur, multum ingenii habuisse et facundiæ fateor, vel ob hoc memoriâ dignum, quod ultimus est fere ex Atticis, qui dici possit orator.'

⁴ Cf. *Cic. Cato M.* 13; *Plutarch, Pyrrh.* 20.

⁵ This was an epitome of the work of Æneas (*Ælian, Tact.* 1), probably referred to by *Cicero, Ad Div.* IX. 25: 'nesciebam te tam peritum esse rei militaris. Pyrrhi te libros et Cineæ video lectitasse.'

⁶ *Plutarch, Pyrrhus*, c. 14.

⁷ See the conjectural restoration of the speeches in Niebuhr, *H. R.* III. pp. 485-494, Engl. Tr.

time,' says Niebuhr,¹ 'history speaks no more of him, but of unworthy confidants of the prince, who was already abandoned to his evil star—his fair days, like his happy ones, were over.'

If we except Demetrius and Cineas, we can scarcely mention one great orator in the period which succeeded the downfall of Athenian freedom. There was, of course, plenty of deliberation and many a spirited harangue, stimulated by some great emergency, at the meetings of the Ætolian Confederacy, which were regularly held at Thermus, and at the convention of the Achæan league at Ægium.² And there can be no doubt that many a burst of true eloquence was heard from such men as ARATUS,³ PHILOPÆMEN,⁴ LYCORTAS,⁵ and ARISTÆNUS,⁶ to say nothing of the harangues of dishonest sycophants like CALLICRATES.⁷ In the frequent embassies, too, which were sent to various Greek states and to Rome, there was an abundant opening for oratorical ability, and we hear of many who distinguished themselves in this way, as CHLÆNEAS the Ætolian,⁸ LYCISCUS the Acarnanian,⁹ DAMIS the Athenian,¹⁰ EUMENES,¹¹ PHILIPPUS,¹² PERSEUS,¹³ ATTALUS,¹⁴ and an Ætolian ALEXANDER,¹⁵ to be distinguished from the Alexandrian poet so designated. But this was not the oratory which leaves its traces on the literature of a nation. Rough and ready, ardent and vigorous, it may often have been; but it was the oratory of soldiers and statesmen, who had no special vocation for public speaking, and who had never gone through a regular training. It was not written down before or after delivery, but passed away on the wind, like the trumpet notes which sounded the onset of battle, or the cries for mercy which rose from the ranks of the conquered. It was not, in the words of Thucydides, an everlasting pos-

¹ *H. R.* III. p. 481.

² Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamkeit*, § 75.

³ Polyb. IV. 8, 2, 14, 7; Plut. V. *Arat.* 23.

⁴ Polyb. XI. 9, XXIII. 10, 8; Liv. XXXV. 37; Plut. *Philop.* 5, 17.

⁵ Polyb. XXIII. 10, 8; Liv. XXXIX. 36.

⁶ Liv. XXXII. 19 sqq., XXXIV. 24.

⁷ Polyb. XXVI. 2; Liv. XLI. 23; Thirlwall, VIII. pp. 377 sqq.

⁸ Polyb. IX. 28—31.

⁹ *Id.* XXII. 14, 6—16.

¹⁰ *Id.* XXXIX. 28.

¹¹ *Id.* *ib.* 11 sqq.

¹² *Id.* *ibid.* 32—39.

¹³ Liv. XXXVII. 53.

¹⁴ *Id.* XLII. 41 sqq.

¹⁵ *Id.* XXXII. 33.

session, but a competitor's effort, to be heard and forgotten.¹ At the same time, forensic oratory fell into desuetude. In the midst of the clash of arms, the courts were silent, and in Bœotia especially, we are told by Polybius, that there was no administration of justice either in public or private causes for twenty-five years.²

§ 2. In this state of affairs it is not at all surprising that oratory became more and more scholastic, and especially after the Romans had established their supremacy in Greece. An elaborately artificial style, in which the apparatus of construction, so far from being concealed or removed, was ostentatiously displayed by the side of the completed work, took the place of those forcible and simple expressions by which Demosthenes and his colleagues had supported the arguments of patriotism. The three classes, into which oratory had been technically divided since the days of Aristotle, assumed an uniformity in this respect. The *epideictic* speech, or formal display of oratorical skill, re-appeared in the *symbolæutic* or deliberative discourse, and in the *dicanic* or forensic address.³ The first of these had been the favourite, and indeed the exclusive province of the older rhetoricians. Protagoras and Gorgias had no other way of exhibiting the eloquence which they professed to teach, and Isocrates had already extended this to other and more practical applications. But in the age of which we are now speaking, all orations became more or less epideictic. As liberty declined,

¹ Thueyd. I. 22, *i.e.*, not a κτῆμα ἐς αἶε, but an ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν.

² Polyb. XXIII. 2, 2 sqq.: τὰ δὲ κοινὰ τῶν Βοιωτῶν εἰς τοιαύτην παρεργονεί καχελίαν ὥστε σχεδὸν εἰκοσι καὶ ἑπτῶν τὸ δίκαιον μὴ διεξήχθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς μήτε περὶ τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν συμβολαίων μήτε περὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐγκλημάτων.

³ For the ἐπιδείξεις, or 'specimens' of the Sophists, see Cresollius, *Theatr. Rhetor.* III. p. 5 sqq.; for the distinction between διάλεξις, μελέτη, and ἐπίδειξις, which might include both of them, see Emperius, *Opuscula*, p. 24; and for the distinction between ἐνδείξασθαι and ἐπιδείξασθαι, see *Schol. Alcib.* I. p. 105 B. Thrasyarchus, the celebrated sophist of Chalcedon, who figures in Plato's *Republic*, and is renowned as the founder of the middle style, wrote not only technical and epideictic treatises, but λόγοι δικανικοὶ καὶ συμβουλευτικοί, which, however, were not extant in the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (οὐκ ἀπολλόλουπε, *Isæus*, 20). See Cope 'on the Sophistical Rhetoric,' *Journal of Philology*, III. p. 273. On the three classes, see the references collected by Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamk.* § 68, note 28—30. They were fully discussed by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric*: see above, chapter XL. § 5, note.

the deliberative discourse was deprived of its real objects. The speaker could only indulge in rhetorical commonplaces, and having no attainable object before him, he was content to exhibit the finished elegance of his declamation, and to prove at least that he understood the theory of his art. Even forensic oratory suffered from the same cause. The corruption of the law courts, and the external compulsion under which the jurymen voted in almost all cases, made it less than formerly the object of the patron to frame such a speech as would persuade his hearers and obtain a verdict. It was more frequently his design merely to exhibit his own skill and command of words than to serve his client, and he would seize on such plausible topics as were most likely to conduce to his declamatory ostentation.¹ The exercises by which the advocates prepared themselves for these forensic displays, and which aimed merely at the charms of elegant composition, had a natural tendency to introduce the same style into the actual pleadings.² There was a special cause for the scholastic form of oratory at Athens in particular. We have seen how the literature of the place gradually centred in the new comedy,³ which was not unconnected with the dramatical rhetoric of Euripides,⁴ and in the schools of philosophy, which existed in so many forms and modifications.⁵ Now, it is to be observed that not only did rhetoric, after the days of Aristotle, pass from the hands of the professional rhetoricians and sophists into those of the philosophers, but the latter became more and more students and teachers of the theory and practice of speaking. Aristotle had established a philosophy of rhetoric—the philosophers became more and more influential—and the use of oratory as a political organ was less and less felt every day. It was quite natural, then, that theory should triumph over practice in this department, and that a kind of speaking,

¹ Quintil. *I. O.* IV. 3, §§ 1, 2: 'plerisque moris est, prolato rerum ordine, protinus utique in aliquem lætum ac plausibilem locum, quam maxime possint favorabiliter, excurrere. Quod quidem natum ab ostentatione declamatoriâ, jam in forum venit, postquam agere causas non ad utilitatem litigatorum sed ad patronorum jactationem repertum est.'

² *Id.* V. 12, § 17.

⁴ *Theatre of the Greeks*, ed. 6, p 133.

³ Above, ch. XXIX. § 8.

⁵ Above, ch. XLVII. § 1.

which exhibited the perfection of scholastic skill, should supersede that which had for its only object the impression which it was calculated to make on a popular assembly. We have mentioned incidentally the philosophers at Athens, and their imitators and pupils the grammarians at Alexandria, who wrote treatises on rhetoric. The immediate successors of Aristotle, and especially THEOPHRASTUS,¹ most actively cultivated this application of philosophy, and we have noticed the rhetorical tendencies of the Peripatetics, LYCON, ARISTON of Ceos, and CRITOLAUS.² DEMETRIUS of Phalerum, who was not only an orator but an adherent of the Peripatetic school, wrote two books on rhetoric.³ The Stoics, particularly CLEANTHES⁴ and CHRYSIPPUS,⁵ composed treatises on this subject. Even the superficial and unlearned EPICURUS felt it necessary to have his own 'art.'⁶ And CARNEADES adopted a system which had no value, except as a theory of the probable, and as an introduction to the philosophy of rhetoric.⁷ The same sort of activity, coupled however more directly with book-learning and philology, was exhibited at Alexandria, and we have seen that all the great writers of that school contributed more or less to the theory of speaking. The rival school of Pergamus also cultivated this study, and CRATES of Mallus,⁸ though a grammarian and critic by profession, exercised some important influence on the rhetorical theories of his day, and perhaps contributed to the foundation of the Asiatic school, in which rhetoric became again indepen-

¹ According to Diogenes Laërtius (V. 46—50), Theophrastus composed the following treatises on rhetoric:—1. *περὶ τῶν ἀτέχνων πρίστων* δ. 2. *περὶ ἐνθυμημάτων* δ. 3. *περὶ εὐρημάτων* δ β'. 4. *περὶ λέξεως* δ. 5. *παραγγέλματα ῥητορικῆς* δ. 6. *προοιμίων* δ. 7. *περὶ τέχνης ῥητορικῆς* δ. 8. *περὶ τεχνῶν ῥητορικῶν εἶδη* ιζ'. 9. *περὶ ὑποκρίσεως*. 10. *περὶ δικανικῶν λόγων* δ. Cf. Quintil. III. 1, § 15. 7, § 1. 8, § 62, X. 1, § 83.

² Above, chapter XLVII. § 4. ³ *περὶ ῥητορικῆς* δ β' (Diog. Laërt. V. 80).

⁴ *περὶ τέχνης* (Diog. Laërt. III. 174).

⁵ Cic. *Orat.* 42; Dionys. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 4; Aulus Gellius, XI. 12. There are fragments of his rhetoric in Plut. *De Stoic. repugn.* cc. 5, 28.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. X. 13: *σαφὴς δ' ἦν οὕτως ὥστε ἐν τῷ περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἀξιοῦ μὴδὲν ἄλλο ἢ σαφῆνειαν ἀσκεῖν*. Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 35; Dionys. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 24; Athen. V. p. 187 C.

⁷ Above, chapter XLVII. § 8.

⁸ It must not be forgotten that there was also a professed rhetorician known as Crates of Tralles. Diog. Laërt. IV. 23; Ruhnken, *Hist. Crit.* p. 86, sq.

dent of philosophy, and claimed the rank of a distinct faculty. Of this we have now to speak.

§ 3. It was chiefly at Athens that the teaching of rhetoric was monopolized by the philosophers. The formation of an independent rhetorical school, in which the basis was the practical skill of the Attic orators, and in which theory appeared as an ancillary adjunct, is generally attributed to *ÆSCHINES*, and its first seat was Rhodes, where that orator took up his abode after his defeat in the great cause of the Crown.¹ It is clear, from the anecdotes which are recorded, that at first *Æschines* taught rhetoric by example only, using his own speeches, and sometimes those of his great rival *Demosthenes*, as text-books for his lectures, and as patterns of style. This may explain the statement that when he was first asked to teach rhetoric, he replied that 'he did not even know it himself.'² Eventually, however, it cannot be doubted that he passed from practice to theory. *Philostratus* speaks of him as the head of the second school of sophists, in contradistinction to *Gorgias*,³ and he has the credit of being the first to compose imaginary cases (*ὑποθέσεις, πλάσματα*) and forensic exercises (*μελέται*) for the use of his pupils;⁴ though, as we have seen, the *Tetralogies* of *Antiphon* must have anticipated him in some sense.⁵ But whatever may have been the special performances of *Æschines*, he founded a school at Rhodes which formed the transition, the link of connexion, or at least the stepping-stone, from the pure oratory of Attica to the overloaded diction of the Asiatic rhetoricians.⁶ The Rhodian orators and rhetoricians were *ARTAMENES*, *ARISTOCLES*, *PHILAGRIUS*, and *APOLLONIUS* of *Alabanda*, generally called *MOLO*,⁷

¹ *Vit. X. Orat.* p. 840 D; *Quint.* XII. 10, § 19; *Cic. De Orat.* III. 56; *Phot. Cod.* LXI.

² *Anon. Vit. Æsch.* p. 287, Bekk.: ἐνθα δεομένων αὐτοῦ Ῥοδίων τὴν τέχνην διδάξαι τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἀρνήσασθαι εἰπόντα μὴδ' αὐτὸν εἰδέναι.

³ *Vit. Sophist. Proem.* p. 481: μετεχειρίζοντο τὰς ὑποθέσεις κατὰ τὴν τέχνην οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ Ἀισχίνου, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Γοργίου κατὰ τὸ δόξαν.

⁴ *Phot. Cod.* LXI. p. 62: λέγεται δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος ἐκέισε σχολάζων τὰ πλάσματα καὶ τὰς λεγομένας μελέτας συνθεῖναι.

⁵ Above, chapter XXXIII. § 2.

⁶ *Cic. Brutus*, 13, § 51, *Orator*, 8, § 25; *Quintil.* XII. 10, § 18.

⁷ *Dionys. Hal. De Dinarcho*, 8, p. 645, *Reiske*.

who is well known as a teacher of Cicero.¹ The chief theorist of this school was HERMAGORAS of Temnos, whose views are controverted by Cicero² and espoused by Quintilian,³ and whose works seem to have treated of all the most important parts of rhetoric.⁴ The school at Rhodes, as a distinctive manifestation of Greek oratory, had only a temporary existence, as a means of transition to that which was formed in Asia Minor. After this last had established itself as a substitute for the old healthy oratory of Athens, it reacted on the Rhodian school, and the two brothers, HIEROCLES and MENECLAS of Alabanda, whom Cicero mentions in high terms of commendation,⁵ and describes as patterns of imitation for all their contemporaries in Asia,⁶ certainly transferred their peculiarities to Rhodes, for Apollonius Molon, the head of the Rhodian school in Cicero's time, was a pupil of Menecles.⁷ The founder of the Asiatic school, to which the Rhodian teaching of Æschines served as the means of transition, was HEGESIAS of Magnesia,⁸ who is also known as the historian of Alexander the Great. He seems to have been an early contemporary of Timæus, and probably flourished in the reign of the first Ptolemy.⁹ A passage from the rhetorician Agatharchides, cited by Photius,¹⁰ contains some specimens of his style which are sufficiently faulty; Plutarch has given us an example of his silliness when he says that the temple of

¹ Cicero heard him first at Rome (*Brut.* 89, § 307), and about nine years afterwards at Rhodes (*ib.* 90, § 312). He must be distinguished from the other Rhodian Apollonius known as *μαλακός*, who was a little his senior (see Clinton, *H. F.* III. p. 147, 157), and who is mentioned by Cicero, *De Orat.* I. 17, § 75.

² *De Invent.* I. 6, § 8, I. 9, § 12, *Brut.* 76, § 263, 78, § 271.

³ *I. O.* III. 5, § 14.

⁴ See the passages quoted by Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamk.* § 83, note. The Hermagoras of Temnos, mentioned by Cicero, must be distinguished from the Hermagoras of Temnos, called Carion, who flourished in the time of Augustus, and whose books are mentioned by Suidas, s.v. *Ἑρμαγόρας*.

⁵ *Brutus*, 95, § 325: 'in primis ut Asiatico in genere laudabiles.' *Orator.* 69, § 231: 'minime meâ sententiâ contemnendi.'

⁶ *De Oratore*, II. 23, § 95: 'ut hodie [*i.e.*, in the time of Crassus] Alabandensem illum Meneclem et ejus fratrem Hieroclem, quos ego audiavi, tota imitetur Asia.'

⁷ Strabo, XIV. p. 655.

⁸ *Id.* XIV. p. 648.

⁹ C. Müller, *Scriptores Alexandri Magni*, Paris, 1846, p. 138. That he was rather before Timæus, appears from the fact that he founded the school of rhetoric to which Timæus belonged.

¹⁰ Phot. *Cod.* CCL.

Diana at Ephesus was naturally enough burnt down while the goddess was engaged in attending at the birth of Alexander,¹ and Dionysius of Halicarnassus declares that in all his numerous works he had not left a page that was felicitously written.² He professed to be an imitator of the Attic writers, especially Lysias³ and Charisius,⁴ but he is regarded, by the common consent of the ancient critics,⁵ as a corrupter of the Attic style, as one of those who mistook bombast for sublimity, and thought themselves inspired when they were merely silly.⁶ Another rhetorician of this school was CLEOCHARES of Myrlea in Bithynia, who was the writer of a considerable number of works,⁷ and is quoted by Photius⁸ as the author of the good saying that 'the speeches of Demosthenes were like the bodies of soldiers, those of Isocrates like the bodies of wrestlers,' a saying which he seems to have borrowed from Philip of Macedon.⁹ He was a contemporary and friend of Arcesilaus, whose revclries he endeavoured to restrain.¹⁰ Other Asiatic orators or rhetoricians, such as DAPHNIS, MYRON, SOSICRATES, ÆSCHYLUS of Cnidus, ÆSCHINES of Miletus, MENIPPUS of Stratonicea, DIONYSIUS of Magnesia, and XENOCLES of Adramyttium, are known to us only by name. We have already mentioned Menecles and his brother. The orators of this Asiatic school are divided by Cicero¹¹ into two classes: the one sententious and subtle, distinguished rather by rhetorical ornaments than by weight and force of style; the other not so sententious, but recommended by an airy lightness and rapid flow of diction. In the former he places Timæus the historian, and the two brothers of Alabanda; in the latter, Æschylus of Cnidus, his own contemporary Æschines of

¹ *Vita Alexandr.* c. 7.

² *De Compos. Verb.* c. 18, p. 122, Reiske.

³ *Cic. Orat.* 67.

⁴ *Id. Brutus*, 83. The orations attributed to Charisius were supposed by some to have been written by the comic poet, Menander; see Quintil. X. 1, § 70.

⁵ With the exception of Varro: *Cic. ad Att.* XII. 6.

⁶ Dionys. *De Compos. Verb.* c. 4, pp. 27, 30; Longinus, *De Sublim.* III. 3.

⁷ Rutil. Lupus. I. 3.

⁸ *Cod.* CLXXVI.

⁹ Phot. *Cod.* CCLXV.; *Vit. X. Orat.* p. 845 C.

¹⁰ Diog. Laërt. IV. 41, p. 281, Casaubon. The reading in the old editions is Λεωχάρους τοῦ Μυρλεάνου. But he is obviously intended, as he is also meant, under the name Κλεοφάνης ὁ ῥήτωρ ὁ Μυρλεανός, in Strabo, XII. p. 566 C.

¹¹ *Brutus*, 95, § 325.

Miletus, and the whole of the Asiatic orators of his own time. But in both of these classes the Asiatic rhetoricians were types of degeneracy from the old Attic standard, from which they deviated in dialect and language no less than in the higher attributes of oratory;¹ they glittered with feeble ornaments, which might win the admiration of young students, whose judgment is not mature, but could not please the chastened and sober taste of the grown-up statesman,² and, as a great English orator has observed, it was only for a time that Cicero himself 'fell into a less pure manner through the corrupt blandishments of the Asian taste.'³ We may regret the loss of the treatise in which the acute critic Cæcilius of Calacte discussed the difference between the Attic and Asiatic styles,⁴ but we can have no difficulty in imagining the absolute inferiority of the latter, as a lifeless school-rhetoric, to the former, which flowed from the very heart of free Athenians speaking to men who had still wills of their own.

§ 4. The nature of the theories which occupied the attention of the teachers of rhetoric during the period which we have been considering is known to us chiefly from the Roman writers, who framed their own systems on the school-rhetoric of the Greeks. None of the Greek treatises of this epoch have come down to us. The two books on rhetoric by Demetrius Phalereus are lost, and the essay 'on interpretation' (περὶ ἐρμηνείας), which bears his name, is the work of a later rhetorician. The works on the art of speaking which emanated from the schools of the philosophers by profession have shared the fate of their other compositions. And this is the more to be regretted, because the tendency of the period was to wrest the department of rhetoric out of the hands of the philosophers who had appropriated it, and to transfer it to the schools in which rhetoric alone was professed. It would have been very interesting if we could have compared contemporary treatises by those who claimed rhetoric as a branch of philosophy, and

¹ The gradual corruption of Attic Greek at this time has been discussed by Sturz and Salmasius in their treatises on the Hellenistic dialect.

² Cicero, *Brutus*, §§ 325, 326.

³ Brougham's *Works*, vol. VII. p. 120.

⁴ The title of this lost work was: τίμι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ξῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ. Suidas, s. v. Καίκιλος.

those who maintained for it the rank of an independent study, to which philosophy and all other branches of knowledge were ancillary and subordinate. Cicero, in his Treatise on the Orator, gives us a lively account of a debate on this question between the rhetorician Menedemus and the academic philosopher Charmadas, which took place at Athens when Crassus was on his way to Cilicia.¹ The philosophers were not always content to monopolize rhetoric. They sometimes disparaged it in the strongest terms. Besides Charmadas, we are told that Cleitomachus the Academic, and Critolaus the Peripatetic, wrote against rhetoric, and denied its existence as a separate art.² It had less eminent opponents in Athenodorus of Rhodes, and Agnou, who wrote a book called 'the accusation of rhetoric.'³ There is little doubt that this rehabilitation of the rhetorical schools, in contradistinction to the philosophical, produced effects most unfavourable to the philosophy of rhetoric as it had been established by Aristotle. He, as we have seen,⁴ bestowed his main attention on the doctrine of proofs and the theory of the affections, and discussed much more briefly, in a sort of supplementary book, the subject of oratorical style and the parts of the oration. His object was to train the public speaker by connecting him more intimately with the logician and moral and political philosopher. In making themselves independent of philosophy, the rhetorical theorists became quite unphilosophical. Instead of busying themselves with the orator, they confined themselves to the oration; instead of indicating the fountains of thought and argument, they contented themselves with regulating the streamlets of words; instead of drawing the ground-plan and elevation, which is the business of the architect, they set up the scaffolding, and, what is worse, they too often left it standing after the edifice was completed. Every speech was to be constructed according to certain rules, and the regularity was so pedantic and externally obvious, that it was more conspicuous in its machinery than in its results. In a word, what Aristotle had made the basis and bulk of his treatise on rhetoric was omitted altogether by those rhetorical schoolmen, and they wrote endless treatises on the

¹ *De Oratore*, I. 18—20.

² Quintil. II. 17, § 15.

³ Sextus Empiricus, II. 12, 20.

⁴ Chapter XL. § 5, p. 290 [130].

style and parts of the oration, which he had treated as merely supplementary and subordinate questions.

As far as we can infer from the references to these rhetorical theories,¹ they began by discussing the five parts of rhetoric:² invention (εὑρεσις), or the rules for the selection of topics and arguments; arrangement (τάξις), or the disposition and order of the speech; diction (λέξις), or the choice of words and style; memory (μνήμη), or the art of recollection, which had been cultivated on fixed principles by the Greeks since the time of Simonides, and which, at the time of which we are speaking, was reduced to definite rules by Charmadas and Metrodorus of Scepsis;³ delivery (ὑπόκρισις), which Demosthenes had pronounced the first, second, and third requisite of oratory,⁴ which the rhetoricians themselves found it very difficult to teach,⁵ and which some of the Roman orators learned from eminent actors like Roscius.⁶ They generally adopted the fourfold division of the speech which had been laid down by their great authority Isocrates,⁷ namely, introduction (προοίμιον), statement (διήγησις), proofs (πίστεις), and peroration (ἐπιλόγος). How far the division of the proofs into *confirmation* and *refutation*, which we find in the later rhetoricians,⁸ with their adjuncts *partition*, *proposition*, and *egression*, which are mentioned by Quintilian,⁹ or the *partition* only, which is added by Cicero,¹⁰ are derived from the Greek rhetoricians of this school, cannot be exactly ascertained, but we may fairly give them credit for all these refinements. It is quite clear that the technical distinction of the *general thesis* (θέσις) from the *special case* (ὑπόθεσις)¹¹ belongs to the Greek rhetoricians before the time of Cicero. He tells us so expressly,¹² and the words themselves indicate it; for they effect by the mere difference between a simple and a compound term, what the Romans were obliged to express by different words, such as *quæstio* or *propositum* for the *thesis*, and *causa* for the *hypothesis*. The chief effort,

¹ See Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamk.* § 83.

² Cic. *De Oratore*, II. 19, § 79.

³ Cic. *ibid.* II. 86—88, 90.

⁴ *Id. ibid.* III. 56.

⁵ Auct. ad Herennium, III. 11.

⁶ Cic. *De Oratore*, I. 29.

⁷ Dionys. Hal. *De Lysid.* 16 sqq. p. 489, Reiske.

⁸ See Quintil. *I. O.* III. 9, § 1, IV. *Proœm.* § 6.

⁹ u.s. III. 9, § 1—5.

¹⁰ *De Inventione*, I. 14.

¹¹ Quintil. III. 5, § 5.

¹² *De Oratore*, II. 19, § 77, 31, § 133.

however, of the Greek rhetoricians was bestowed upon the definition of the 'state of the case' (στάσις, *status, constitutio*). The first theorist on this subject was either NAUCRATES, a pupil of Isocrates, or ZOPYRUS of Clazomenæ, a friend of Timon the Sillographer.¹ The origin of the term seems to be a metaphor derived from the posture of the boxer in taking his place in the ring, and Quintilian supposes that Æschines, in using this metaphor, refers to its technical application by the rhetoricians, which is clearly a faulty recollection of the context.² It really denotes the issue joined on a question,—the position assumed by the accuser and defendant. There were many writers on this subject, whose works, now lost, are cited by Quintilian;³ the Roman rhetorician has discussed the question at great length, and we have still the treatise *περὶ στάσεων* by the celebrated rhetorician Hermogenes, who flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. As far as we can learn, the oldest division of the issues was threefold—the conjectural issue (στοχασμός, *status conjecturalis*), the definitive (ὁρος, *status definitivus*), and the qualitative (ποιότης, *status generalis*). The first raised the question of fact, whether the act had been done or not. The second required the definition of what had been done. The third joined issue on the quality of the act. Thus it was a conjectural issue, if the judges had to determine with regard to a particular allegation *an fecisset reus*; it was definitive, if the question was *quid fecisset*, but qualitative, if they had to inquire *an recte fecisset*. For this threefold division of the *sitne, quid sit, quale sit*, adopted by Cicero, on the authority of Antonius, who expressed them as *factum, non factum; jus, injuria; bonum, malum*; the more recent writers substituted at least eight, resulting chiefly from subdivisions.⁴ An interesting question might arise, if we had

¹ Quintil. III. 6, § 3. For the intimacy between Zopyrus and Timon, see Diog. Laërt. IX. 114.

² Quintilian says (u.s.): 'videtur Æschines quoque in oratione contra Ctesiphontem uti hoc verbo, cum a iudicibus petit, ne Demostheni permittant evagari, sed eum dicere de ipso *causa statu* cogant.' The words of Æschines are (*adv. Ctesiph.* p. 83, § 207): ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὁρᾶτε τοὺς πύκτας περὶ τῆς στάσεως ἀλλήλοις διαγωνιζομένους.

³ *Inst. Or.* III. 6, § 31 sqq.

⁴ See Capperonnier's note on Quintilian, p. 181.

the older books which discussed these rhetorical issues, how far they rested on the categories of Aristotle. It may be inferred, from what Quintilian says,¹ that they regarded those categories as involving the elements of all questions, and he considers that the first four belong to the *στάσεις* of the rhetoricians, while the other six refer only to certain topics of argument. It would not be too much to suppose that, as the cases of the noun have derived their Latin names from the proceedings in the law courts at Rome,² the categories, the name of which signifies 'accusations' as well as 'predications,' suggested the idea of a similar classification of the questions which the rhetorician was called upon to discuss and set in order. If Timæus of Tauromenium, whose history we are about to discuss, was the author of the collection of rhetorical theses (*συλλογῇ ῥητορικῶν ἀφορμῶν*) which Suidas attributes to him, and which Ruhnken has assigned to the sophist of the second century A.D., it seems probable that he also was a writer on the rhetorical theories of which we have been speaking.³

¹ III. 6, § 23: 'Aristoteles elementa decem constituit circa quæ versari videatur omnis quæstio . . . sed ex his omnibus prima quatuor ad status pertinere, cetera ad quosdam locos argumentorum videntur.'

² The *nominative* and *genitive* indicate the plaintiff and his father, or, as we should say, his christian and surname; the *dative* and *accusative* denote the accused, from the phrases *diem dicere alicui* and *accusare aliquem*; the *ablative*, the party from whom satisfaction was sought, or who had sustained the loss; and the *vocative* summoned him into court.

³ Suidas says: ἔγραψεν Ἱταλικά καὶ Σικελικά ἐν βιβλίοις ἡ, Ἑλληνικά καὶ Σικελικά, Συλλογὴν ῥητορικῶν ἀφορμῶν βιβλία ξή. It seems to us that the number ξή ought to be put before the word Συλλογὴν. Müller (*Fragm. Hist.* p. LI.) takes συλλογὴν in apposition with the words that precede: 'sententia mea eo inclinatur ut Suidæ verba de historico Timæi opere intelligenda putem, quod propter indolem suam severior quidam Tauromenitæ censor συλλογὴν ῥητορικῶν ἀφορμῶν appellaverit.' This seems to us a most improbable conjecture. As a rhetorician of the Asiatic school, Timæus might very well write a book on *theses* or *stases*, which would probably be called ἀφορμαί. The word was so understood by Alexander, where in speaking of a declamation in favour of the Macedonians, he quoted the lines of Euripides (*Bacch.* 266):

ὅταν λάβῃ τις τῶν λόγων ἀνὴρ σοφὸς
καλὰς ἀφορμὰς, οὐ μέγ' ἔργον εὖ λέγειν.

And Thrasyarchus, the great sophist, is said by Suidas (s.v.) to have written ἀφορμὰς ῥητορικὰς, which, in his case, can have only one meaning.

CHAPTER XLIX.

TREATMENT OF HISTORY.—POLYBIUS AND HIS IMMEDIATE
PREDECESSORS.

§ 1. Life of Timæus. § 2. Character of his history, and its relations to that of Polybius. § 3. Other forerunners of Polybius. § 4. Political career of Polybius. § 5. Analysis of his history. § 6. His style and characteristics.

§ 1. **I**N speaking of the minor historians of the classical period, we found it convenient to notice the writers of the *Atthides*, which commenced in that period; and, among them, we had to mention Philochorus of Athens, who was a contemporary of Timæus, and probably followed him in his chronological investigations; and Ister of Alexandria, who gave to the Sicilian historian his nickname of ἐπιτίμαιος, ‘the fault-finder.’ We did not include Timæus himself in these anticipations, because he had no retrospective reference to that class of historians, and because he belongs to the period which we are now discussing, both as a representative of the Asiatic school of rhetoric mentioned in the preceding chapter, and as having written the work which Polybius perpetually criticizes, and in continuation of which that historian wrote his own immortal narrative.

TIMÆUS was a native of Tauromenium in Sicily, which his father Andromachus had founded in Ol. 96, I. B.C. 396, and had strengthened by settling there the Naxians, whose city had been destroyed by Dionysius in Ol. 105, 3. B.C. 358. As his history is brought down to B.C. 264,¹ and as the Pseudo-Lucian states² that he was ninety-six years old when he died, it is inferred that he was born about B.C. 352, and that he died about B.C. 256.³ It is stated by Suidas that he received instructions from Philiscus of Miletus, the pupil of Isocrates; but when and how they met is quite unknown. In B.C. 310,

¹ Polyb. I. 5, 1.

² *Macrob.* 22.

³ See Müller, *Fragm. Hist.* p. L.; cf. Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 11.

when he was forty-two years old, Timæus was expelled from Sicily, along with other eminent men, by Agathocles,¹ who was about to embark his forces for Africa, and who wished both to fill his coffers by spoliation and to get rid of influential opponents.² Athens offered a safe and agreeable place of refuge, and Timæus, as he tells us himself, lived there uninterruptedly for nearly fifty years, in perfect tranquillity and in the enjoyment of literary leisure.³ There is every reason to believe that he was a friend and associate of Philochorus, whose influence at Athens extended over nearly the whole of this period. At any rate, the taking of Athens by Antigonos Gonatas, and the death of Philochorus, which ensued, obliged Timæus to leave the city which had so long afforded him a hospitable retreat, and he returned to Sicily, probably to Syracuse, in B.C. 260. While at Athens, he had completed his great work.⁴ In the few remaining years of his life he wrote his account of the expedition of Pyrrhus, which was published in a separate form.⁵ According to Suidas, the following is a list of his works: (1) concerning Syria and its cities and kings, in three books; (2) on the history of Italy and Sicily, in eight books; (3) on the history of Greece and Sicily, in sixty-eight books (?); (4) a collection of rhetorical theses; (5) the Olympic victors, or chronological essays (Ὀλυμπιονίκας ἢ χρονικὰ πραξίδια). To the first of these works we have no reference, and it has been conjectured that the words include a corrupt citation of the work about Pyrrhus.⁶ There is no reason, however, why Timæus should not have written about Syria, and the three books were probably a digression in his great work on the history of Greece and Sicily in general. For Hellas included all countries in which Hellenes ruled or were settled. The eight books on Italy and Sicily may also be considered as having eventually been incorporated in the great work. And there seem to have been some twelve books on Sicily in

¹ Diodor. XX. 4.

² Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, XII. p. 555.

³ l. XXXIV. quoted by Polybius, XII. 25 i. Cf. XII. 25 d: ἀποκαθίσας γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν σχεδὸν ἑτη πεντήκοντα.

⁴ Plutarch, *De Exilio*, p. 439, Wytténb.

⁵ Cic. *Epist. ad Fam.* V. 12; Dionys. Hal. I. 6.

⁶ Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, p. LI.

particular. If, then, the work, in its final and complete form, contained sixty-eight books, and if eight of these were appropriated to Italy and Sicily, twelve to Sicily alone, and three to Syria, and if five of the remaining books—according to Polybius the last five¹—treated of the history of Agathocles in particular, there will be a total of forty books for the other subjects of the history, including the books on Pyrrhus, which, if they were comprised in the general work, must have followed the five books about Agathocles. Assuming, therefore,² ten books for the history of Pyrrhus, the catalogue of the historical works, which made up the sixty-eight books of Timæus mentioned by Suidas, will be as follows: The first section, in eight books, referring to the early history of Italy and Sicily in particular; the second section, in twelve books, devoted to Sicily alone; the third section, in thirty books, containing the history of Sicily and Greece in the ages when the historian's native island was in constant intercourse with the mother country; the fourth section, in three books, giving a separate account of the Greek kings in Syria; the fifth section, in five books, treating specially of the life and career of Agathocles; and the sixth section, in ten books, containing the history of Pyrrhus. There will remain the rhetorical treatise, and the chronological work, which was perhaps an accessory labour connected with the history.

§ 2. If we may judge from the fragments which have come down to us, the history of Timæus was a life's labour of industrious compilation and minutely searching inquiry. It

¹ XII. 25 i.: *ὅτι Τίμαλος φησιν ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ καὶ τετάρτῃ βιβλίῳ.*

² We make this assumption merely on grounds of symmetry and general probability. With the preceding eight books for Italy and Sicily, and twelve for Sicily alone, the general history would make thirty books: then there would be another $3 + 5 = 8$ books for the episodes about Syria and Agathocles; and ten books would not be too much for the history of Pyrrhus and the Romans with whom he came in contact. In a tabular form it will stand thus:

Section.	Books.
First ... Italy and Sicily	1—8.
Second ... Sicily alone	9—20.
Third ... Sicily and Greece	21—50 or (1—30).
Fourth ... Cities and kings of Syria ...	51—53 or (31—33).
Fifth ... Agathocles	54—58 or (34—38).
Sixth ... Pyrrhus and the Romans ...	59—68 or (39—48).

seems to us most reasonable to conclude that, as he wrote the history of Pyrrhus after his return to Sicily, he composed the eight books more particularly referring to that island and Italy previously to his banishment by Agathocles. A pupil of Philiscus, and probably a literary man by profession, it was not likely that he would pass the first forty-two years of his life without putting pen to paper, and the writings of Antiochus and Philistus would be very likely to stimulate his feelings of rivalry.

According to the latest arrangement of these remains,¹ the *first* book discussed the mythical history of Sicily with a good deal of antiquarian research,² and took notice of the Etruscans,³ Romans,⁴ and Carthaginians.⁵ The *second* book seems to have dealt with the geography and ethnography of the nations which had most to do with Sicily in early times.⁶ The *third*, *fourth*, and *fifth* books treated of the foundation of the Greek colonies in Sicily, especially that of Syracuse.⁷ In the *sixth* book there was a reference to the Callicyrians or Helots of the Dorian colonists, who rose against their masters and established a democracy in Syracuse.⁸ The *seventh* book contained a good deal about Sybaris.⁹ The *eighth* book is never mentioned. In the *ninth* book, the first perhaps which he wrote at Athens, he commenced the history of Sicily in particular, which he carried down to Ol. 88, 2, B.C. 427, when Gorgias prevailed upon the Athenians to succour the Leontini, and so brought Sicily on the stage of Greek history.¹⁰ This part of the work, according to a reasonable conjecture, was entitled Σικελικά, 'Sicilian history,' without any reference to Italy or Hellas.¹¹ In how

¹ That of Müller, in the *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, Paris, 1841.

² For example, he was the first to point out the interesting fact that the name of Italy was derived from *Ἰταλός* = *vitulus*, Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* XI. For the bearings of this fact, see Niebuhr, *H. R.* I, p. 18; *Varronianus*, p. 4 note, 2nd ed.

³ Athen. IV. p. 153 D; XII. 517 D.

⁴ Dionys. Hal. *A. R.* I. c. 74; Plin. *H. N.* III. 13.

⁵ *Fragm.* 23, Müller.

⁶ Thus he mentioned Sardinia (Plin. *H. N.* III. 13), Corsica (Polyb. XII. 3), Marseilles (Steph. Byz. s.n. Scymn. Chius, v. 208, sqq.), &c.

⁷ Polyb. XII. 4 d.

⁸ Suid. s.n. Καλλικύριοι.

⁹ Athen. XII. 519 B.

¹⁰ Dionys. Hal. *De Lysiâ judicium*, c. 3; Polyb. XII. 25 o.

¹¹ Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* p. LIII.

many books it was contained does not appear. But Empedocles is referred to in the eighteenth book;¹ and if this number has regard to the history of Timæus in its collected form, there must have been at least ten books of the *Σικελικά* alone. It would probably extend to twelve books, so that the part of the work before the *Hellenica* commenced would be, in round numbers, twenty books. We have references to various numbers after this, but it is impossible to say whether we are to count from the ninth book, or from the twenty-first, when general history is referred to, or from the first book of all, where the reference is to Sicily in particular. For example, the citations from the thirteenth about Hyccara² might very well refer to the fifth book of the *Σικελικά*, in particular. The citation from the twenty-second book, about Democles and Dionysius the younger,³ would seem to refer to the third section, which, as we have suggested above, amounted to thirty books. The reference to the twenty-first book, about Timoleon,⁴ must be an error either for the twenty-eighth or for the thirty-first. If the latter, this reference, together with those to the thirty-fourth and thirty-eighth books, must have belonged to the thirty-eight books of the third, fourth, and fifth sections, which completed the writings of Timæus down to the period of his return to Sicily. But, according to our conjecture, books 31—33 referred to Syria, and books 34—38 to Agathocles. We therefore prefer the number 28 for the reference to Timoleon.⁵ The quotation from the thirty-fourth book,⁶ referring to the author's fifty years' residence at Athens, is probably taken from the preface to the section about Agathocles, which we know must have been the conclusion of the general history.

¹ Diog. Laërt. VIII. 60 : φησὶ δὲ καὶ Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ιη' κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους τεθναυμάσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα (i.e. Empedocles).

² Athen. VII. p. 327 B : Τίμαιος δ' ἐν τῇ τρισκαίδεκάτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν περὶ τοῦ Σικελικοῦ πολιχνίου (λέγω δὲ τῶν Ἰκκάρων) διαλεγόμενος, κ.τ.λ.

³ Id. VI. p. 250 A : Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν, Δημοκλέα φησι, τὸν Διονυσίου τοῦ νεωτέρου κόλακα, κ.τ.λ.

⁴ Polyb. XII. 25 : ἐν γὰρ τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκοστῇ βίβλῳ, καὶ ταύτης ἐπὶ τελευτῇ, λέγει κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιμολέοντος παράκλησιν ταῦτα . . . 26 a : πάλιν δὲ ὁ Τιμολέων ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ βίβλῳ παρακαλῶν τοὺς Ἕλληνας.

⁵ The change from KA to KH is easier than from KA to AA.

⁶ Polyb. XII. 25 i : οἱ Τιμαῖος φησιν ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ καὶ τετάρτῃ βίβλῳ.

The chief interest which now attaches to the lost histories of Timæus is derived from his relations to Polybius. That great writer expressly makes the termination of Timæus the beginning of his own work. 'We shall assume,' he says, 'as the beginning of this book the first transit of the Romans from Italy; and this is continuous with the circumstances with which Timæus left off, and coincident with the 129th Olympiad.' He therefore intended his history as a sequel to that of Timæus; and fragmentary as much of it is, it still abounds with direct citations of its predecessor. Nevertheless, Polybius rarely mentions Timæus except in terms of the severest censure. The explanation of this is simple enough. It was never the intention of Polybius to write an ancient history. He had, as we shall see, a special object, and he wanted only a starting-point. This he found in the most voluminous, the most recent, and probably, at that time, most popular writer on history, Timæus, the long-lived chronicler of Tauromenium. Accordingly, as Timæus had terminated his narrative at the point when the Romans first left their peninsula and carried their conquering arms across the sea into Sicily, Polybius took this point as the beginning of a narrative, which had for its object the foreign conquests of the masters of Italy. Just in the same way, Smollett and other continuers of English history were content to take Hume as the basis of their labours, because he had carried his annals down to a certain point, and was, at that time, the latest and most esteemed historian. But although he accepted Timæus as his predecessor, Polybius did not feel himself in any manner obliged to conceal the opinion which he had formed as to the best mode of writing history, or to abstain from criticizing Timæus in those particulars in which the difference between the two writers was most striking and flagrant. Polybius thought it the duty of the historian to spare no pains in acquiring a knowledge of facts, by personal inquiries and by frequent voyages and travels. He thought that the writer of a political and military history ought to be himself a statesman and a warrior. And, brought up in the

¹ I. 5, § 1: ὑποθησόμεθα δὲ ταύτης ἀρχὴν τῆς βίβλου τὴν πρώτην διάβασιν ἐξ Ἰταλίας Ῥωμαίων. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶ συνεχὴς μὲν τοῖς ἀφ' ὧν Τίμαιος ἀπέλιπε· πίπτει δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐννάτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατὸν Ὀλυμπιάδα.

bustle of real life, he had no sympathy with the artificial and scholastic rhetoric of the literary men of his age, and was contented with such an expression of his meaning as was sufficient for practical purposes. He therefore despised a book-worm like Timæus,¹ who had spent the greater part of his life in literary retirement, and who frankly admitted his total inexperience in military matters.² He regarded with much scorn a writer who undertook to describe places which he had never visited.³ And the love of legends and the acceptance of all that he found written, which was as conspicuous in Timæus as in the writings of his friend Philochorus and the other Atthidists, seemed to Polybius indications of a despicable and truly childish credulity.⁴ We can easily understand why, besides these objections, the style of Timæus was so offensive to Polybius. Accustomed to the pithy and business-like harangues of the Achæan conventions, he could not tolerate the unreal and pedantic exertitions which Timæus put into the mouths of great personages.⁵ And the specimen, which we have in the speech which he attributes to Hermocrates,⁶ quite justifies the censures of Polybius on this account. In addition to the discrepancy between his own character and that of Timæus, there is no doubt that the acrimony of Polybius was stimulated by the captious and censorious spirit in which the Sicilian had treated his own predecessors, especially Theopompus and Ephorus.⁷ This fault-finding temper exposed Timæus to the sharp censure of other writers as well as Polybius: the inscription-hunter Polemon, who was opposed to Ister in other respects, agreed with him in censuring Timæus; and Ister had given the latter a nickname, which stuck to him—that of *Epitimæus*, ‘the censorious.’⁸ This tendency on the part of

¹ The book-learning of Timæus is thus estimated by Polybius, CXII. 25 d, § 1: πρὸς τοῖς τῶν προγεγονότων ὑπομνήμασι γενόμενος, ὑπέλαβε τὰς μεγίστας ἀφορμὰς ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν· ἀγνοῶν ὥς γε μοι δοκεῖ.

² Polybius, XII. 25 i, § 1, quotes as follows from Timæus, book XXXIV: πεντήκοντα συνεχῶς ἔτη διατρίψας Ἀθήνησι ξενιτεύων καὶ πάσης ὁμολογουμένως ἄχρηστος ἐγενόμην πολεμικῆς χρείας, and adds: καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς τῶν τόπων θέας.

³ II. 16, § 15; XII. 25 g.

⁴ XII. 4 b, § 2: πρᾶγμα πάντων παιδαριωδέστατον.

⁵ XII. 25 a, 25 b, 25 m, 25 n, 25 o.

⁷ XII. 4 a, § 1 sqq.; XII. 28, § 10 sqq.

⁶ Athen. VI. p. 272 B: ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τίμαιον ἀντιγραφαῖς.

⁶ Polyb. XII. 25 p.

Timæus was sometimes explained by personal hostility, as in the case of Agathocles, whom he never treats with ordinary fairness. And Polybius does not hesitate to charge him with distorting the truth, in spite of his better knowledge, whenever he felt a bias, whether hostile or favourable.¹ And the minuteness of his strictures aggravated their injustice in the eyes of Polybius, and rendered him liable to the more stringent criticisms on his own account: 'Who could pardon such blunders,' he says, 'especially in a man like Timæus, who objects to the smallest blemishes in other writers?'²

But though these severe censures are explained by the different views which Polybius and Timæus would naturally take of the duties of the historian, and though they may be occasionally well deserved, we must not accept them for more than their real worth, or suppose that Timæus was an insignificant or worthless writer. The very opposition between the character and career of the two men would render Polybius more likely to exaggerate the faults of Timæus, and we know that he was very much given to extenuate the merits and enhance the defects of those whose works were most useful to him. There can be little doubt that Timæus was one of the most painstaking and accurate of all the rhetorical and book-learned historians. The chronological investigations, in which he was the first to engage, mark an honest and truth-loving mind. And though, like the Atthidists, he indulged in mythological lore, and this to such an extent that he was called Γραοσιλλεκτρία, 'the compiling

¹ Polybius, *apud Diodor.* XIII. 90: πολλὰ ἱστορεῖ ψευδῇ ὁ Τίμαιος καὶ δοκεῖ τὸ παράπαν οὐκ ἀπειρος ὦν οὐδενὸς τῶν τοιούτων· ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς φιλονεικίας ἐπισκοτούμενος, ὅταν ἅπαξ ἢ ψέγειν ἢ τοῦναντίον ἐγκωμιάζειν τινὰ προθῆται, πάντων ἐπιλανθάνεται καὶ πολὺ τι τοῦ καθήκοντος παρεκβαίνει. His chief hero was Timoleon, who had been the benefactor of his father Andromachus; see Cic. *ad Div.* IV. 24; Marcellin. *Vit. Thucyd.* § 42.

² Polyb. XII. 4 a: τίς ἂν ἐτι δολῇ συγγνώμην τοῖς τοιοῦτοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν, ἄλλως τε καὶ Τιμαίῳ τῷ προσφυνόμενῳ τοῖς ἄλλοις πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας παρωνυχίας; Creuzer, *Histor. Kunst d. Griechen* (p. 313, note), says, 'this is a proverbial expression which Ang. Mai has translated in quite Ciceronian Latin: qui ceterorum historicorum tam importune *reduviam* curat; see Cic. *pro Ros. Am.* 44, § 128. The Greek word occurs twice in Plutarch, *De Audit.* p. 43, p. 163, Wyttenb. and *De discrim. adul. ab amico*, p. 277 B. It would be in German *sich an den Niednagel hängen*, to stick to the hangnails. Polybius repeats the same reproach, no. 128, p. 401, ed. A. Mai.'

old woman,' 'the dealer in old wives' fables,'¹ he seems to have done the good work of relieving the old legends from the rationalistic and mock historical form, in which the Isocratean historians had begun to clothe them,² and to have exhibited them in their native simplicity, as poetical fictions. In the midst of his disparagement, Polybius cannot refrain from testifying³ to the inquisitive spirit and laborious diligence of Timæus. Cicero, who cites him as the best example among the historians of the first class of Asiatic style,⁴ says:⁵ 'Timæus, as far as I can judge, by many degrees the most learned of historians, and abounding more than all others in copiousness of matter and variety of expression, and not unpolished in style and composition, brought much eloquence to this department of writing, but no practice in forensic oratory.' And although Longinus cites him as a pregnant example of frigidity, he says that 'Timæus was in other respects an able historian, and not barren in oratorical sublimity; that he was erudite and inventive, but that he was most censorious in regard to the faults of others, and unable to perceive his own.'⁶ On the whole, it seems right to admit that if Timæus had most of the faults, he had also most of the merits of a rhetorical and learned historian; and if, like other *Doctores Umbratici*, he indulged in strong censures when he detected trifling inaccuracies, we must not forget his real services because he has been treated with a censoriousness at least equal to his own.

§ 3. Of the more immediate forerunners of Polybius, the most eminent was his father's colleague, ARATUS of Sicyon, the general of the Achæan league, who wrote memoirs of his own times in thirty books. This work, which is entirely lost, carried down the history of Greece to the year 220 B.C., seven

¹ Suidas, s. v. Τίμαιος. This name was probably given him by Ister; see the authorities referred to by Creuzer, u. s. p. 313.

² See Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, I. p. 552.

³ XII. 26, f. 2: δοκεῖ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὴν ἐμπειρικὴν περὶ ἕκαστα δύναναι καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς πολυπραγμοσύνης ἕξιν παρεσκευάσθαι καὶ συλλήβδην φιλοπόνως προεληλυθέναι πρὸς τὸ γράφειν τὴν ἱστορίαν.

⁴ *Brutus*, 95.

⁵ *De Oratore*, II. 14.

⁶ *De Sublim.* 4: θατέρου δὲ ὦν εἶπομεν—λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχροῦ,—πληρὴς ὁ Τίμαιος, ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἱκανὸς καὶ πρὸς λόγων ἐνίοτε μέγεθος οὐκ ἄφορος, πολυίστωρ, ἐπινοητικὸς, πλὴν ἀλλοτρίων μὲν ἐλεγκτικώτατος ἀμαρτημάτων, ἀνεπαίσθητος δὲ ἰδίων.

years before the death of Aratus, who, as is well known, was poisoned by the order of Philip of Macedon.¹ Polybius makes a special reference to this work in the introduction to his history,² and regards its termination as an epoch. In another passage he praises it, as distinguished alike by the genuineness of its facts and the perspicuity of its style.³

Another eminent writer of the age of Aratus was PHYLARCHUS, whom Athenæus claims for his own city Naucratis,⁴ and whom Suidas assigns either to that city, or to Athens, or to Sicyon.⁵ The latter probably was suggested by his relations to Aratus. He was perhaps a Naucratisite settled at Athens. Besides other works of which we know nothing,⁶ he wrote a valuable history in twenty-eight books, which discussed the Italian expedition of Pyrrhus and other affairs down to the reign of Euergetes, and the war between Antigonus and Cleomenes.⁷ In the same work, no doubt, he treated of Antiochus and Eumenes, on which Suidas supposes that he wrote a distinct monograph.⁸ Polybius charges him with undue partiality to Cleomenes, and with hostility to Aratus, whose account he much prefers to that of Phylarchus.⁹ But the countercharge might be brought against Polybius himself. And though Plutarch has concurred in the censure,¹⁰ there can be no doubt in the minds of those who read the account of Cleomenes, which he has borrowed from Phylarchus, that the latter was quite justified in his favourable opinion of the Lacedæmonian king, and that Polybius was blinded by party spirit. On many accounts we must regret the loss of Phylarchus.¹¹ It would have been very

¹ See the vivid account in Polybius, VIII. 14; Plut. V. *Arati*, 52.

² I. 3, § 2; Cf. IV. 2, § 1.

³ He says (II. 40, § 4), that he shall only give a summary account of the actions of Aratus: διὰ τὸ καὶ λίαν ἀληθινοὺς καὶ σαφεῖς ἐκείνων περὶ τῶν ἰδίων συντεταχέναι πράξεων ὑπομνηματισμούς.

⁴ II. p. 58 C.

⁵ s. n. Φύλαρχος Ἀθηναῖος ἢ Ναυκρατίτης· οἱ δὲ Σικυνώνιον, ἄλλοι δὲ Αἰγύπτιον ἔγραψαν.

⁶ Suidas enunciates six works in all, Eudocia only four.

⁷ It seems not improbable that the history of Phylarchus began at the death of Alexander the Great; see Schöll, *Hist. Lit. Gr.* III. p. 133.

⁸ Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* p. LXXIX.

⁹ II. 56—59, 60—63.

¹⁰ *Vit. Arati*, 38.

¹¹ Niebuhr says (*Kleine Schriften*, I. p. 270): ‘Phylarchus belongs to the writers

advantageous to view the history of the Peloponnesus from two different sides, and, as far as we can learn, the style of Phylarchus, though perhaps ostentatious and declamatory, was very lively and gave great effect to the vigour of his narratives. Dionysius indeed classes Phylarchus with Polybius himself as one of those whom no one can endure to read through,¹ but this is merely an outbreak of classical purism.

Another of the immediate forerunners of Polybius was PHILINUS or PHILENIUS of Agrigentum,² who wrote a continuation of Timæus, including a history of the first and second Punic wars. The ill treatment which Agrigentum received from the Romans made him, Polybius tells us, as partial to the Carthaginians as Fabius Pictor was to his own countrymen. 'Looking to their life and principles, I do not suppose,' says Polybius,³ 'that these writers intentionally spoke untruly, but it seems to me that they were much in the same case as lovers. For, owing to his party spirit and unmingled good-will to the Carthaginians, Philinus thinks that they acted in all respects with prudence, honour, and courage, and that the conduct of the Romans was just the reverse. Whereas Fabius takes precisely the opposite view.' It is much to be regretted that we have no specimens of his work, which might have fulfilled the remark of the lion in the fable, namely, that if lions were painters, the man would not always be represented as uppermost.

Of two other writers on the Punic wars, CHÆREAS and SOSILUS, the latter of whom, like Philinus, took the Carthaginian side, Polybius writes in the following terms:⁴ 'With regard to writings such as those of Chæreas and Sosilus, there can be no occasion to say more, for in my opinion their rank

whom I pity as much as I regret their loss. The judgment which Polybius passes on him, though not groundless, is nevertheless prompted by the party spirit of an Achaean Arcadian, hating Cleomenes, whose great qualities he is nevertheless obliged to recognize.'

¹ *De Compos. Verb.* p. 30, Reiske. Phrynichus (p. 425, Lobeck) remarks on a quotation, by Gaius Arethasius, from Phylarchus, as an authority in Greek : ὁ τοῦ μάπτρου, ὡς εἶπε τοῦ ἐπαγομένου.

² See Corn. Nep. *Hannib.* 13 ; Cic. *Divin.* I. 24.

³ I. 14, § 2. Cf. Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, III. p. 573.

⁴ III. 20, § 5.

and value are not those of history, but those of the gossip which takes its rise in a barber's shop or in a vulgar crowd.'

§ 4. The long life of POLYBIUS was more stirring and adventurous than that of most literary men.¹ His father, Lycortas of Megalopolis, was one of the most distinguished leaders of the Achæan league, and was appointed general of the confederacy on the death of his friend Philopœmen in B.C. 182. As the historian tells us² that no one up to his time had borne the name of Polybius, we may perhaps adopt the suggestion that the Achæan general, who commanded under Philopœmen against Machanidas,³ was called by the more common name Polybus,⁴ and was a relation of Polybius, whose name was therefore lengthened by way of distinction. The date of the historian's birth is fixed at B.C. 204. He tells us that he was not of full age,⁵ that is, not thirty,⁶ when he went to Egypt, in B.C. 181, along with his father and the younger Aratus, as an ambassador from the league. The Pseudo-Lucian tells that he had reached the age of eighty-two, when he died in consequence of a fall from his horse.⁷ This was some time after the conquest of Numantia in 133, for he wrote a history of that war.⁸ If he was born in B.C. 204,⁹ he was twenty-five at the time of the embassy, and died in B.C. 122.

The public career of Polybius, in connexion with the Achæan league, extended from the death of Philopœmen in B.C. 182, to the overthrow of the Macedonian monarchy in B.C. 168. When

¹ There are elaborate and able articles on Polybius in the dictionaries of Pauly and W. Smith, the latter by the editor himself, and the former by Dr. C. Fuchs.

² XXXVII. I. f. § 4. It has been supposed that Πολύβιος is a synonym of Μακρίβιος, but as we have the name Polybiades by the side of Alcibiades and Eurybiades, the patronymics of Alcibiades and Eurybiades (also Eurybies), son of Eurystheus, it is reasonable to conclude that the word refers to βία rather than βίος.

³ XI. 15.

⁴ Lucht, *ad Phylarchi Fragm.* p. 81.

⁵ XXV. 7.

⁶ XXIX. 9.

⁷ *Longævi*, c. 22.

⁸ *Cic. ad Div.* V. 12.

⁹ Daunon (*Biogr. Univers.* tom. XXXV.) puts the birth of Polybius between 210 and 200; Schöll (*Hist. Lit. Gr.* III. p. 226), before 205; Westermann (*ad Voss. de Hist. Gr.* p. 164), before 211; Nitzsch (*Polybios*, p. 118, Kiel, 1842), between 213 and 210. Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 119, says: 'his birth could not be earlier than B.C. 210, and his death could not be earlier than B.C. 129.' The date, which we have assumed, is suggested by Casaubon (*ad Polyb.* pp. 1064, 1071, 1079).

Philopœmen was buried, the young Polybius bore the urn to its resting-place.¹ In the following year, as has been mentioned, he went as ambassador to Egypt. On his return, he was for some years one of the leaders of the moderate party, which opposed the intrigues of the Romanizing Callicrates, and was denounced, along with Archon and his father, by the Roman ambassadors who came to Greece in B.C. 169.² In the discussions which arose it was resolved to deviate from the neutrality recommended by Lycortas, and to join the Romans in their war against Perseus. Archon was made general of the forces, and Polybius commander of the cavalry, and in this capacity was sent to Macedonia to receive the consul's instructions. Although the proffered aid was declined,³ Polybius remained in the Roman camp till he was sent back by Marcius for the purpose of preventing his countrymen from complying with the demand for five thousand auxiliaries which they had received from Appius, the Roman general in Illyria.⁴ In B.C. 168, the Ptolemies, Philometor and Physcon, applied to the Achæan league for aid against Antiochus, and asked either for a force commanded by Lycortas and his son, or for the aid of those two officers without any troops.⁵ 'The celebrated circle of Popillius precluded the need of this or any other assistance.'⁶ Although it does not appear that in these transactions the party of Polybius in the league had given any good grounds for complaint on the part of the Romans, the two commissioners, C. Claudius and Cn. Domitius, who came to the Peloponnese after the overthrow of the Macedonians, were induced by the misrepresentations of Callicrates to demand that certain eminent persons, whom they refused to name, should be sentenced to death for contributing to the aid of Perseus by pecuniary supplies and in other ways.⁷ The Achæan assembly insisted that the accused should be first of all named. And the Romans, at the suggestion of Callicrates, stated that the charge included all who had held the office of general since the

¹ Plut. *Philopœmen*, 21; *An seni*, &c. p. 790.

² Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, VIII. 406.

³ Polyb. XXVIII. 6, § 10 sqq.

⁴ *Id.* XXVII. 11, § 7 sqq.; Thirlwall, p. 423.

⁵ Polyb. XXIX. 8, § 5.

⁶ Thirlwall, p. 424.

⁷ Pausanias, VII. 10.

commencement of the war. One of the persons thus implicated, Xenon, imprudently offered to meet the charge before a Roman tribunal. As this proposal was eagerly accepted by the Roman commissioners, Callicrates was able to draw up a list of one thousand names, including all whom he hated or feared, that is, all the best men in the league; and the Romans compelled all these to sail for Italy, when, instead of being put on their trial, they were distributed among the towns of Etruria, and became, in fact, exiles under supervision, or prisoners of war. Polybius, who was of course one of those deported from Greece, had made the acquaintance of Æmilius Paullus and his sons in Greece,¹ and the young men obtained permission from the prætor to receive him into their father's house.² The intimate friendship which thus sprung up between Polybius and Scipio Æmilianus the younger son of Paullus, then a youth of eighteen, was maintained to the end of the life of Polybius, and contributed more than any other circumstance to forward his literary projects by facilitating the journeys which he undertook for the purpose of acquiring information, and by procuring him access to the *libri Censuales* and other documents at Rome.³

After an exile or captivity of seventeen years, the proscribed Achæans, who were reduced from one thousand to three hundred,⁴ were permitted to return to Greece,⁵ and Polybius

¹ Liv. XXXV. 28.

² Polyb. XXXII. 9, § 5. Appian (*Pun.* 132) calls Polybius the διδάσκαλος of Scipio Æmilianus; and he may have been employed as a Greek tutor during the first year of his exile. That he was the confidential friend and adviser of Scipio is well known; see Plut. *Sympos.* IV. 1; Vell. Pat. I. 13; Ammian. Marcell. XXIII. 2.

³ Casaubon says, in the dedication to his edition: 'linguam Romanam Polybius didicit, atque antiquissima monumenta, quæ vix pauci e Romanis civibus intelligebant, et Capitulinâ æde ut promere sibi liceret impetrato, in sermonem Græcum transtulit, ac Romanos ipsos procures suæ civitatis jura docuit, quæ ipsi ignorabant.' Cf. Niebuhr, *H. R.* I. p. 238, and note 1014. For his ability to avail himself of documents written in obsolete Latin, see what he says of the old treaty with Carthage (III. 22), and for his general use of Roman authorities, see XXXII. 9, § 4; I. 62; III. 32, sqq.; VII. 9; XV. 18; XVI. 15.

⁴ Pausan. VII. 10, § 12: ἐπτακαίδεκάτῳ δ' ὕστερον ἔτει τριακοσίους ἡ καὶ ἑλᾶσσανας, οἱ μόνοι περὶ Ἰταλίαν Ἀχαιῶν ἐλίποντο, ἀφιάσι. Polyb. XXXII. 7, § 15: τοὺς μὲν γὰρ πλείστους σχεδὸν ἅπαντας ὁ χρόνος ἤδη καταηλώκει τοὺς γε δὴ καὶ μνήμης ἀξίους.

⁵ Polybius, not satisfied with the permission to return, asked that the exiles

revisited his native country for a short time. He gave the best counsels he could to the league, but was quite unable to check the progress of events. In the first year of the third Punic war, B.C. 149, he was summoned to Lilybæum to attend the consul Manilius,¹ but was stopped at Corcyra by tidings of the submission of Carthage, and returned to Greece.² In B.C. 147 we find him before Carthage, as the companion and, as it seems, the adviser of Scipio Æmilianus.³ The city fell in the spring of B.C. 146, and Polybius hastened from the scene of destruction to Greece, where Mummius had just taken and destroyed Corinth.⁴ In the autumn the Romans sent ten commissioners to assist in regulating the affairs of Greece. Polybius, whose intimacy with eminent Romans was prejudicial to his influence with his countrymen while they still retained their independence, was enabled by this circumstance to mediate between the victors and the vanquished. He secured the wives and children of the condemned in the possession of their confiscated property, he prevailed upon the Romans to leave standing or to restore the statues of Aratus, Philopœmen, and others,⁵ and was permitted to take such a part in the municipal legislation as tended to mitigate the rigour of the Roman enactments, and to restore at least some of the outward marks of Greek civic independence.⁶ His services were highly appreciated by the Peloponnesians, and statues were erected to his honour at his native city of Megalopolis, at Mantinea, Tegea, and other places. An inscription on one of these, written in elegiac verse, made a complimentary allusion to his travels, and commemorated his successful mediation with the Romans.⁷

should be restored to their former honours, and sounded Cato on the subject, who said, with a smile, that Polybius wished, like another Ulysses, to go back into the den of the Cyclops to seek the cap and girdle that he had forgotten (Plut. *Cato Major*, c. 9, p. 341; *Apophthegm.* p. 199).

¹ Polyb. XXXVII. 1 e, § 1.

² *Ibid.* § 3.

³ Polyb. XXXIX. 3, § 6; Diodor. *Excerpt. Vatic.* XXX. 8, p. 93, Mai; Appian. *Punic.* c. 132; Pausan. VIII. 30, § 9.

⁴ Polyb. XL. 7, § 1.

⁵ *Id.* XL. 7 a, §§ 3, 8, 10.

⁶ *Id. ibid.* §§ 10—13.

⁷ He speaks of honours conferred upon him in his lifetime (XL. 10, § 4), but see Pausan. VIII. 30, § 8, where the phrase *ὡς ἐπὶ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν πᾶσαν πλα-νθελειν* seems to imply that the statue was erected after his death.

Another inscription declared that Hellas would not have fallen from the first had she followed the counsels of Polybius in all things, and that when she failed she was succoured by him alone.¹

During the remainder of his long life, Polybius was occupied principally in writing his historical works, or in the journeys which he undertook for the purpose of gaining a knowledge of different countries. Pliny tells us² that when Scipio Æmilianus was carrying on the war in Africa, Polybius, with a fleet which Scipio had placed at his disposal, surveyed the coast from Mount Atlas towards the west. And Polybius himself speaks of having encountered great dangers and undergone great sufferings in exploring Africa, Spain, Gaul, and the sea which washes the coasts of the latter countries.³ Besides his embassy to Egypt at an early part of his life, he revisited that country in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon, *i.e.* after B.C. 146.⁴ Here he probably met Scipio and Panætius.⁵ Soon after this he undertook the western journeys already mentioned.⁶ It is not known when he paid the visit to Rhodes which enabled him to examine the archives of that island,⁷ but it is probable that this took place in his earlier days, when he was in Asia Minor⁸ and travelled to the Euxine.⁹ He was at Sardis in the consulship of Cn. Manlius Vulso, B.C. 189,¹⁰ but this was long before he undertook journeys with a literary object. It is inferred that he was at the siege of Numantia in B.C. 134, as he wrote an account of that war. Perhaps it would be most reasonable to conclude that this was the last of his journeys. The declining years of his life were seemingly spent in Greece,¹¹ where he died, and his history was manifestly written for the benefit of his countrymen,¹² and to obtain a reputation in Hellenic literature. He might hope to obtain a few readers at Rome, but his object was to explain to the Greeks how the power of their conquerors had established itself, and to continue down to his own times

¹ Polyb. XL. 37, § 2.

² V. i. § 9. He sailed through the pillars of Hercules, and arrived at the river Daras and the country of the *Æthiopes Dararitæ*; Plin. VI. 199.

³ III. 59, § 7.

⁴ XXXIV. 14.

⁵ Cic. Acad. IV. 2.

⁶ Cf. *Excerpt. Vaticana*, p. 460, with II. 14—17; III. 47, sqq.; X. 10.

⁷ III. 15, § 8.

⁸ XXII. 21, § 12.

⁹ IV. 38—45.

¹⁰ XXII. 21, § 5.

¹¹ *Excerpt. Vat.* p. 460.

¹² I. 3, § 8.

the elaborate history of Timæus. Of his personal tastes and habits we know nothing, except that, like Xenophon, he was fond of hunting,¹ and he lost his life in consequence of a fall from his horse.

§ 5. Besides the history, of which we are about to speak, and the narrative of the siege of Numantia, to which we have already referred, Polybius seems to have written 'the life of Philopœmen,'² from which in all probability Plutarch and Pausanias derived their accounts of that general; a treatise 'on Tactics,'³ a letter to Zenon of Rhodes 'on the situation of Laconia,'⁴ and a treatise to prove that the countries south of the equator were not inhabited.⁵

The great work of Polybius was 'a general or universal history' (καθολικὴ καὶ κοινὴ ἱστορία, τῶν καθ' ὅλου σύνταξις),⁶ 'a general and comprehensive narrative of events' (καθόλου καὶ συλλήβδην οἰκονομία τῶν πραγμάτων).⁷ Of the forty books, of which it consisted, only the first five have come down to us complete, the rest being represented only by fragments and extracts more or less considerable. The work falls into three main divisions: (I.) An introduction in two books, written for the purpose of connecting it with the history of Timæus,⁸ and of filling up the time between the end of his book and the end of the annals of Aratus.⁹ In this introduction (προπαρασκευή)¹⁰ he treats of the period from B.C. 264 to B.C. 220, and discusses the events which occurred in Italy, Africa, and Greece during that time, especially the first Punic war, and the history of the Achæan league down to the battle of Sellasia. (II.) The main part of the work, in thirty books, of which the object is to show how the Romans laid the foundations of their sovereignty of the world (οἰκουμένη). It includes a period of fifty-three years from B.C. 220 to B.C. 168, during which the Romans conquered the Carthaginians, the Syrians, and the Macedonians. (III.) The epilogue in ten books, of which the object is to show the helplessness and vanity of the different attempts made to disturb the dominion of Rome down to the taking of Corinth in B.C. 146,

¹ XXXI. 22, § 3. Cf. XXXII. 15, § 8.

² X. 24, § 5 sq.

⁴ XVI. 20, § 5.

⁶ VIII. 4.

⁷ I. 4.

⁸ I. 5, § 1.

³ IX. 20, § 4.

⁵ Geminus, *Elem. Astr.* c. 12.

⁹ I. 3, § 2.

¹⁰ I. 13, § 1.

when the history of Greece, as an independent country, may be said to have terminated. Perhaps no historical work was ever written with such definiteness of purpose or unity of plan, or with such self-consciousness on the part of the writer. The first and second divisions of the work were prefaced by an elaborate statement of what the author was about to write, and of the objects which he had in view,¹ and after having finished his intended narrative in the thirty-ninth book, he devoted the fortieth to a chronological summary and retrospect of the whole.² The general object of Polybius was much the same as that of Thucydides, namely, to treat past history as the best guide of our present actions. He therefore calls his history 'a business-like, systematic work,' 'a history for statesmen.'³ Omitting the idle investigations of previous writers into questions of mythology and the like, he adopts, as he tells us, 'the business-like or political style (*πραγματικὸς τρόπος*),' first, because the continual change in the progress of events requires a corresponding novelty of narration, and secondly, 'because this style of history always was the most useful (*ὠφελιμώτατος*) of all, and is now especially so, since in our times experience and art have made such progress, that those who wish to learn may do so systematically (*μεθοδικῶς*).' 'We therefore,' he adds, 'have been led to this style because our object is not so much the gratification of our readers as the advantage of those who are interested in these questions.'⁴ The object to which he wishes to direct attention, is, generally, the manner in which fortune or

¹ The general programme of books I. and II. is given in I. 13, and of books III.—XL. in III. 2—5.

² Mai *apud Clinton*, F. H. B. C. 146.

³ His terms are *πραγματικὴ ἱστορία* (I. 2, § 8), *πραγματεία* (I. 3, § 1). In the later Greek writers *πραγματεία* means any regular work in writing. But it signified, in the classical age, careful and practical investigation, like *μέθοδος* (see Aristot. *Topic*. I. 1). That its meaning in Polybius is to be explained from the adjective *πραγματικός* is sufficiently clear. And his favourite use of the adjective is to denote 'serviceable in state matters' (VII. 12, § 2; III. 5, § 7; III. 118, § 12), and, therefore, as a synonym of *πολιτικός*. Hence it signifies that which is serviceable in any way—strength of body (XXVI. 5, § 6), or mind (XXXIX. 1, § 1). Hence, again, it is applied to whatever is effective; arguments (XXXVI. 3, § 1) are called *λόγοι ἀνδρώδεις καὶ πραγματικοί*, an attack (V. 5, § 4) is termed *αἰφνίδιος καὶ πραγματικὴ ἐπίθεσις*, and even a hillock (IV. 70, § 10) is described as *ἄκρας εὐφροῦς καὶ πραγματικῆς ἔχων τάξιν*.

⁴ IX. 2, §§ 4—6.

providence (for he seems to include this in *τύχη*) uses the ability and energy of man, as instruments in carrying out what is predetermined,¹ and specially the exemplification of these principles in the wonderful growth of the Roman power during the fifty-three years of which he treats. Former times could deal only with the separate histories of particular nations; but the conquests of Rome had brought all the inhabitants of the civilized world into a sort of contact, and enabled the historian to interweave the contemporaneous events, so as to form one consistent whole.² In no other way could the general view of the case be obtained. 'I do not deny,' says Polybius,³ 'that one might learn to a certain extent from particular histories, how the Romans took Syracuse or conquered Spain, but it would be difficult to comprehend, without a general survey of history, how they arrived at universal dominion, what partial opposition they met with, and what contributed on the other hand to their success.' To speak of blind fortune, as in itself the cause of great events, appears to Polybius altogether unreasonable.⁴ He will not allow that the beginning (*ἀρχή*) is the cause (*αἰτία*). For example, it would be absurd to call the taking of Saguntum, which was the *beginning* of the second Punic war, its *cause*.⁵ This is the language of those who cannot distinguish between the cause (*αἰτία*), the beginning (*ἀρχή*), and the pretext or alleged grounds (*πρόφασις*). 'I,' he says,⁶ 'give the name of *beginnings* to the first attempts and doings of things already decreed; but *causes* are what precede decisions and determinations, such as thoughts, dispositions, and reasonings, and whatever leads to judgments and resolves.' Fortune then, or providence, of whose dealings the Roman power was the most illustrious and instructive dispensation,⁷ seizes on opportunities

¹ I. 5; V. 31, 105; IV. 28, &c.

² I. 37, 63; VI. 43; XXXII. 16.

³ VIII. 4, §§ 5, 6.

⁴ XVII. 11, § 5.

⁵ III. 6, §§ 1—3.

⁶ *Ibid.* § 7.

⁷ I. 4, § 4: τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ ὠφελιμώτατον ἐπιτήδευμα τῆς τύχης. He adds: πολλὰ γὰρ αὕτη καιροποιούσα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐναγωνίζομένη τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίοις οὐδέπω τοιόνδ' ἀπλῶς οὐτ' εἰργάσατο ἔργον οὐτ' ἠγωνίσαστο ἀγώνισμα οἷον τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς. 'These words,' says Creuzer (*Hist. Kunst d. Gr.* p. 416), 'exclude blind chance, and take Fortune, in the Stoic sense, as a being which works with reason and fixed purpose.' He also remarks, that 'in the Stoic system fortune (*τύχη*, *εἰμαρμένη*) is identical with Providence or the highest reason (*summa ratio*), and means merely the dispensation of God' (Wytténb. *ad Plat. Phad.* p. 227: Creuzer, *ad Plotinum*, III. 1, p. 134, sqq.; VI. 8, p. 402). See above, chapter XLVII. § 7.

and avails itself of deeply rooted causes. Thus the unjust attack of Philip and Antiochus on the infant King of Egypt gave Fortune an opportunity of urging the Romans to the conquest of those princes.¹ The courage and ability of Scipio Æmilianus were the causes of his successes, and Fortune only employed him as her agent.² Above all, the political constitution and military arrangements of the Romans were the causes of the victories which they gained and of the empire which they established, and Polybius devoted one of his books to an examination of these peculiarities. Accordingly, the history of Polybius is professedly an investigation of causes with a view to the explanation of their results; it is, as he calls it, 'a demonstrative history,'³ and the moral obviously is to convince the Greeks that they ought to acquiesce in the inevitable domination of Rome,⁴ and to enjoy the blessings of peace under the protection of those destined and irresistible conquerors.⁵

The following is the order of subjects adopted by Polybius as far as it can be ascertained. The *first two* books, as has been mentioned, are a general introduction in continuation of Timæus, and discuss the first Punic war, the affairs in Illyria, Gaul, and Etruria, and the history of the Achæan league, down to the defeat of Cleomenes at Sellasia. At the end of the second book he points out the connexion between this introduction and the following books, which are designed to treat generally of the Social war in Greece, the war with Hannibal in Italy, and with Antiochus in Cœle-Syria.⁶

The *third* book carries the second Punic war down to the battle of Cannæ. The *fourth* and *fifth* books are devoted to the affairs of Greece and Syria. The *sixth* contained an

¹ XV. 20, § 6.

² XXXII. 16, § 3.

³ II. 37, § 3: οὕτως ἤδη τῆς ἰδίας καὶ ἀποδεικτικῆς ιστορίας ἀρχώμεθα. Creuzer considers this term also an indication of the Stoicism of Polybius (u. s. p. 414). Herodotus, however (I. 1), calls his book an ἀπόδειξις ιστορίας.

⁴ III. 4, §§ 7, 8.

⁵ IV. 74, § 3.

⁶ II. 71, §§ 9, 10: καθήκον ἂν εἴη (the student will observe the Stoic phraseology), παραγεγονότας ἐπὶ τούτους τοὺς καιροὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πρόθεσιν, ἐν οἷς ἐμελλον οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες τὸν Συμμαχικόν, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὸν Ἀννιβιακόν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν βασιλεῖς τὸν περὶ Κόιλης Συρίας ἐνίστασθαι πόλεμον, καὶ τὴν βίβλον ταύτην ἀφορίζειν ἀκολούθως τῇ τε τῶν προγεγονότων πραγμάτων περιγραφῇ καὶ τῇ τῶν κεχειρικόντων τὰ πρὸ τῶν δυναστῶν καταστροφῇ.

elaborate history of the Roman constitution, with some notice of the Carthaginian. The *seventh* book treated of various contemporary events in Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor. The *eighth* contained the siege of Syracuse, the capture of Tarentum, the death of Aratus, and other events in Asia and Greece. The *ninth* was also occupied with miscellaneous events. It contained remarks on the character of Hannibal, and the military art.¹ The chief subject of the *tenth* was Scipio's campaign in Spain, but it carried on the contemporary history in Italy and Greece also. Philopœmen in Greece, and Scipio in Spain were the heroes of the *eleventh* book. Our fragments of the *twelfth* are chiefly criticisms of Timæus and Callisthenes. Philip, Nabis, and Antiochus appeared on the stage in the *thirteenth* book. The *fourteenth* and *fifteenth* books contained the end of the second Punic war, and the beginning of the Roman contact with Philip, who was the chief subject of the three following books. Of the *nineteenth* we have only one short fragment. The *twentieth* and two following books treated of the Ætolian, Syrian, and Gallogræcian wars. The *twenty-third* and *twenty-fourth* books were taken up with the affairs of the Achæans and Macedonians, and the same subjects, in the main, were pursued in the two following. The war with Perseus of Macedon, and the affairs of Syria and Egypt, occupied the *twenty-seventh*, *twenty-eighth*, and *twenty-ninth* books. Of the *thirtieth* book we have fragments relating chiefly to embassies. In the *thirty-first* book Polybius narrated the history of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Roman alliance with Rhodes, the visit of Ptolemy Physcon, and the flight of the hostage, Demetrius Nicator.² In the *thirty-second* book, besides a narrative of the transactions in Dalmatia, Epirus, and Asia

¹ It is interesting to read his remarks on the necessity of a professional training for military men. The chief requisite, he thinks, is γεγεωμετρηκέναι, μὴ τελείως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐφ' ὅσον ἀναλογίας ἐννοίαν ἔχειν καὶ τῆς περὶ ὁμοιότητος θεωρίας (IX. 20, § 1). He exclaims against the absurdity of supposing that, while the dancer and musician must go through a course of study, τοὺς στρατηγίας ἀντιποιομένους ἀσχάλλειν εἰ δεήσει τῶν ἐκτὸς ἐπιτηδευμάτων μέχρι τινὸς ἀναλαβεῖν (*Ibid.* § 8).

² Polybius gives a very minute and somewhat exciting account of this affair, in which he took an active part himself (XXXI. 19—23). It is, in fact, one of the liveliest pictures in the history.

Minor, Polybius gave a very interesting account of Scipio Æmilianus, and of his own relations with that eminent Roman.¹ The *thirty-third* book contained, among other subjects, the Ligurian war and the affairs of Prusias and Attalus. Our fragments of the *thirty-fourth* book are all geographical. The *thirty-fifth* treated of the Celtiberian war. The *thirty-sixth* and *thirty-seventh* were taken up mainly with the third Punic war. The *thirty-eighth* and *thirty-ninth* contained the Achæan war, and the destruction of Corinth and Carthage, and the *fortieth*, as we have already mentioned, was a chronological retrospect of the whole work.

§ 6. Taking his history as a whole, and comparing the uniformity of the design with the accuracy and diligence of the execution, it is scarcely possible to speak in too high terms of Polybius. Still he has met with much censure, and with very limited appreciation. Of the Greek and Latin historians, there is perhaps no one who is so little read in the original language, even by the professed students of the classical authors. For one hundred who are familiar with Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, there is perhaps scarcely one who has gone through even a book or two of Polybius. Perhaps the chief cause of this neglect is to be found in the real faults of his style, which have been greatly exaggerated by some of his critics. Dionysius of Halicarnassus classed him with the writers whom no one could endure to read to the end of a chapter.² A modern admirer, who has vindicated his merits with great spirit and ability,³ is obliged to admit that 'Polybius writes as a man may be expected to write who, having totally neglected the study of composition, sits down in the intervals of a busy life to embody his experience in writing.'⁴ Hence his style is slovenly, somewhat tautological, and infected

¹ XXXII. 8—16.

² *De Comp. Verb.* p. 30, Reiske: οἷος οὐδεὶς ὑπομένει μέχρι κορωνίδος διελθεῖν.

³ 'Extracts from Polybius,' in Knight's *Quarterly Magazine*, vol. II. p. 65. The writer of this article, who assumes a fanciful designation, is known to be an eminent Cambridge scholar.

⁴ This is a mistake. As we have seen, the literary life of Polybius was not interrupted by business, but was the peaceful termination of his long career.

with colloquial verbiage. It bears some resemblance to that of a modern newspaper despatch. His manner, indeed, is a proper envelope for his matter—homely, substantial, and business-like. The change which we experience in passing from the pages of Thucydides or Xenophon to those of Polybius, is the same as if the Parthenon had been taken down, and the materials had been converted into barracks or warehouses.⁷ Even his poetical panegyrist laments that the slighted Graces pine over his style, and compares him to a sweet fruit with a rugged rind.¹ The true explanation of the unattractive diction in which Polybius has written his history, is suggested by the indications of Stoicism which are so apparent in his general sentiments.² The view respecting fortune as a kind of providence working by appropriate instruments, and the avowedly *pragmatic* and *apodeictic* character which he has given to his work, show that he belonged to the Stoic school. His connexion with Panætius, who succeeded him as the philosophical teacher of Scipio Æmilianus,³ and with Lælius,⁴ who had been a pupil of Diogenes the Babylonian, is appealed to as indicating the philosophical sect which he followed. And the attention paid to his work by the three Stoics, M. Brutus, Poseidonius, and Strabo, is also regarded as a confirmation of this inference respecting his speculative opinions.⁵ Now, the Stoics ostentatiously neglected the rhetorical ornaments of style. Cicero says⁶ that ‘their style was perhaps subtle and certainly acute, but for oratorical

¹ Hayley's *Essay on History*, Lond. 1781. The following lines on Polybius are quoted with much approbation by Creuzer (*Hist. Kunst d. Gr.* p. 422):—

v. 283:

Thou friend of Scipio, vers'd in war's alarms,

v. 289:

O highly perfect in each nobler part,
The sage's wisdom and the soldier's art,
This richer half of Grecian praise is thine:
But o'er thy style the slighted Graces pine.
Like Indian fruit, its rugged rind contains
Those milky sweets that pay the searcher's pains.

² See Wyttenbach, *Prefatio ad selecta Principum Historiarum*, p. XVII.; Creuzer, *Hist. Kunst d. Gr.* pp. 414 sqq.

³ Suidas, s.v. Παναίτιος, Πολύβιος.

⁴ Polyb. X. 3.

⁵ Creuzer, *Hist. Kunst d. Gr.* p. 416.

⁶ *De Oratore*, III. 18, § 66. Cf. *Brut.* 31; *De Finibus*, IV. 4, 28.

purposes it is meagre, unusual, running counter to the popular taste, obscure, empty, jejune, and altogether unsuited for public displays.' It was perhaps this Stoic contempt for the beauties of style, combined with his own want of scholastic training, that made Polybius so intolerant of writers like Timæus and Phylarchus, the latter of whom he compares to a tragedian,¹ while he elaborately censures the rhetorical ostentation of the former.² Whatever may have been the causes of it, there can be no doubt that the style of Polybius is really very faulty. The main blemishes in his history are the following, which have been pointed out by the earliest of his critical editors:³ (a) endless digressions; (b) a perpetual and wearisome repetition of his own principles and method; (c) a slipshod reproduction of the same words and expressions;⁴ (d) a sort of Greek vanity, which is always reappearing in spite of his awful sense of the destiny of Rome; (e) slovenly tautology in the same periods and clauses;⁵ (f) constant hyperbata, or inversions of the natural and proper order of words;⁶ (g) careless use of the copulative conjunction instead of a genitive or an adjective;⁷ (h) laxity in the employment of his particles in distributive

¹ II. 56.

² XII. 25.

³ Casaubon, in J. C. Wolf's *Casauboniana*, Hamburg, 1710, pp. 70 foll. The same great scholar speaks with much felicity of the style of Polybius in the admirable dedication of his edition to Henry IV. of France: 'ad harum rerum expositionem,' he says, 'si orationem noster adhibuit nullis calamistris inustam, nullis fractamcincinnis, ac ne diligentius quidem comptam, sed masculam et quodammodo militarem, opus, credo, censorium fecit. Ut poma quædam sunt suaviter aspera, et in vino nimis veteri ipsa nos amaritudo delectat; sic in seriis magnisque scriptoribus minus interdum culta dictio non sine austeritate quædam juvat. Et est sane Polybiana dictio ejusmodi, in quâ multa verba, multas observo locutiones in castris natas, et gloriosum illud Martis pulverem, potius quam rhetorum lecythos et pigmenta redolentes.'

⁴ Casaubon, u. s.: 'magnâ lectoris æquitate opus habet Polybius hâc in parte; nam quis ferat paulo morosior criticus, ut libro præsertim primo θεωρούντες, συνειδότες, et id genus verbis plenæ omnes periodi?'

⁵ *Idem*, u. s.: 'sæpe in eâdem periodo idem verbum bis ponit, ut p. 93, sub fin. καιρῶ et καιροῦ et statim βοηθήσαι, βοηθεῖν.'

⁶ *Id.* u. s.: 'trajectio duriuscula verborum; p. 166: ἀνατρέχειν ἐπειρᾶτο μετὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς παρατάξεως τόπον σημασίας: p. 198: οὐδὲν ἄξιον ἡδυνήθη λόγον βλάψαι: p. 211: sub fin. vox νύκτα.'

⁷ *Idem*, u. s.: 'amat figuram ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, ut p. 6: τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις: p. 198: εἰς ἀνὴρ καὶ μία τέχνη pro ἐνὸς ἀνδρος, &c. &c.'

sentences;¹ (*i*) confusions of number and case;² (*k*) excessive use of compound words; (*l*) introduction of purely poetical terms;³ (*m*) colloquial vulgarisms not yet sanctioned by the use of good writers, but common in the Hellenistic style of a later age.⁴

Among the special characteristics of Polybius we must not omit to mention the space which he devotes to the criticism of his predecessors. Not only Timæus, whom he is always attacking, and to whose demerits he has given up a considerable portion of his twelfth book, but Phylarchus,⁵ Philinus,⁶ Fabius,⁷ Chærcas and Sosilus,⁸ Zeno and Antisthenes,⁹ Theopompus,¹⁰ Callisthenes,¹¹ and others,¹² whose names he does not mention, are the objects of unsparing strictures, sometimes conceived in a very acrimonious spirit. An attempt has been made¹³ to explain this on the supposition that a wish to defend the policy of Scipio has given a polemic tone to his whole work. But it has been well remarked in reply¹⁴ that the controversies raised do not refer only or chiefly to politics. His fault-finding neglects no details, however trifling, and he seems to be always saying, 'I, the *πραγματικός*, the travelled man, who have seen most things with my own eyes, or heard them from eye-witnesses, I am the first true historian, all the rest are mere book-worms, and worth nothing.'¹⁵ All these vituperations, then, are only manifestations of the immense self-consciousness which is a leading characteristic of Polybius.

¹ Casaubon, u. s.: 'ut τῇ μὲν non statim subjiciatur δέ, sed alterum aut tertium μὲν, de quo vide Demetr. Phaler. p. 22. Sic p. 271, πρῶτον μὲν neque aliud sequitur quo hæc referas.'

² *Idem*, u. s.: 'τὸ ἀκαταλληλὸν τῆς συντάξεως; p. 187: εἰ μὴ καὶ τις ἀναγ. ὑπολαμβάνουσι, mira negligentia τις ὑπολαμβάνουσιν; et alibi: ἐκείνων μὲν ἀπολελυμένων σφᾶς δ' αὐτοὺς ἀκμὴν ὑπομένοντας.'

³ *Idem*, u. s.: 'poeticæ voces ut πεπνυμένοις ἀνδράσι, p. 189.'

⁴ *Idem*, u. s.: 'Voces N. T. et Polybio usitatiores quam aliis scriptoribus: μεγαλείον, p. 196; κατασελεῖν τῇ χειρὶ, p. 31; παραδειγματίζειν, p. 58, ἐκτενῶς, *Legat.* 213, *ad hom.* IV. 12; μεθοδεύεσθαι, *Leg.* 227; ὀψώνιον, p. 126: βασιλικός, p. 232, ut Joann. IV.'

⁵ II. 56.

⁶ III. 20.

⁷ XII. 17 sqq.

⁸ Nitzsch, quoted by Fuchs, *Pauly's Real Encycl.* V. p. 1815.

¹⁴ By Fuchs, l. c.

⁶ I. 14; III. 26.

⁹ XVI. 14 sqq.

¹² III. 47 sqq.; V. 33; VII. 7 sqq.; XV. 34.

⁷ III. 3 sqq.

¹⁰ VIII. 11; XVI. 12.

¹⁵ V. 33; XII. 25, 27.

His egotism, which explodes in the direct ventilation of his own merits, is gratified by a wholesale disparagement of other writers, and especially of Timæus, whose work he has continued, and who accordingly came into direct comparison and contrast with him.

Notwithstanding his intention to write only a *pragmatic* and *apodeictic* history, Polybius is quite as discursive as his predecessors, and brings in many subjects by the head and shoulders which have nothing to do either with practical statesmanship or the doctrine of causes. In one passage¹ he makes an elaborate comparison between history and medicine, and in accordance with this he divides *pragmatic* history into three parts—(a) the learning which deals with books already written, (b) the description of cities and places, rivers and harbours, and general peculiarities and distances by land and sea, (c) that which refers to political actions. His object throughout is to give special prominence to the third part, and to undervalue the first; but his geography is a special feature of his book, and, as has been observed, his history is quite as much *physical* as it is *pragmatical*.² In this, however, in spite of his travels, he is by no means a master. His descriptions are far from lucid. For example, the long controversy about the route by which Hannibal entered Italy could not have arisen if Polybius had possessed the peculiar talent for word-painting which is the most desirable characteristic of a geographer by profession.³ And one of our writers, who was himself remarkable for his geographical talent, has expressly denied this faculty to Polybius.⁴

On the whole, we must admit that although Polybius is one of the most valuable writers of antiquity, he is at the same

¹ XII. 25 d, e. The three parts of medicine are the λογικόν, the διαιτητικόν, and the χειρουργικόν. He compares the bad historians to quacks, XXV. e, § 3.

² *Casauboniana*, p. 73: 'historia Polybii, quam ipse vocat πραγματικήν, non id solum fuit, verum etiam φυσική, sed a potiori parte eam auctor denominavit. Quod autem φυσική fuerit apparet ex his reliquiis, ubi toties ad res geographicas divertit.'

³ See Mr. Ellis on *Hannibal's Passage of the Alps*, Cambridge, 1853, where the words of Polybius are thoroughly examined.

⁴ Arnold, *History of Rome*, vol. III. pp. 473, 474.

time the driest and least entertaining of the Greek historians. We may derive the greatest profit and instruction from a study of his remains, but we must always read him with an effort, and lay him down, with the satisfactory feeling that we have done a good work, and with the hope that it will not be necessary to repeat the task.

CHAPTER L.

GREEK LITERATURE DOMESTICATED AT ROME.

§ 1. Native literature of Italy. § 2. Cultivation of Greek literature at Rome.
 § 3. Influence of Greek poetry. § 4. Greek rhetoric. § 5. Greek philosophy.

§ 1. **W**HEN Polybius was tracing the causes which led to the universal domination of Rome, and explaining to his countrymen the providential dispensation to which they had naturally succumbed, he seems to have been unable to predict the reaction of his country's intellectual superiority on the nation whose military and political system had triumphed over the feeble organization of the Achæan league ; he could not suggest the consolation which the descendants of the Romans in a subsequent age derived from the substitution of a literary and ecclesiastical for a real and material empire ;¹ he could not anticipate the state of things some hundred years after his own death, when, as a Roman satirist says:

Greece in the toils her savage victor caught,
 And civil arts to rustic Latium taught.²

He made no attempt to realize the phenomenon which presented itself at Rome, when Greek authors wrote and pub-

¹ Laurentius Valla, in the preface to his *Elegantie* (ed. Ald. 1536, fol. 4), says, that although other nations had established more extensive or more lasting empires, 'nullos tamen ita linguam suam ampliasset ut nostri fecerunt, qui per totum pæne occidentem, per septentriones, per Africæ non exiguam partem brevi spatio linguam Romanam celebrem et quasi reginam effecerunt.—Amisimus Romanam, amisimus regnum, amisimus dominatum ; verumtamen per hunc splendidiorem dominatum in magnâ adhuc orbis parte regnamus. Nostra est Italia, nostra Gallia, nostra Hispania, Germania, Pannonia, Dalmatia, Illyricum, multæque aliæ nationes. Ibi namque Romanum imperium est, ubicumque Romana lingua dominatur.' He has forgotten to mention that this was owing partly to a literature, which the Romans had derived from their Greek subjects.

² Horat. *Epist.* II. 1, 156 :

Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
 Intulit agresti Latio.

lished there in their own language,¹ when illustrious Romans chose the idiom of Plato as the best vehicle for the expression of their own thoughts,² when dramatic poets gained a reputation by versions and imitations more or less exact and literal of the tragedies and comedies of Athens,³ and when, abandoning the old Saturnian rhythm, every versifier felt himself compelled by an overruling fashion to receive with rules of uncompromising prosody the metres of ancient Greece.⁴ But, although Polybius did not notice the causes which led to this state of things, they had been in full operation for many years before his death, and if he had not been so much taken up with narrating and explaining the events which occupied the fifty-three years before the taking of Corinth, he might have seen in no very distant perspective the new home that was in preparation for the exiled Muses of Greece.

The naturalization of Greek literature at Rome was due in the first instance to the rudeness and poverty of the native literature of Italy. For a long time the ancient Italians had nothing in writing except ancient laws and treaties, generally in the form of inscriptions on stone, epitaphs invariably in this form, rituals and other religious books,⁵ and ballads or lays, in which the worthies of old Rome were celebrated, and which were destined for recitation either in public or at the festive meetings of the family.⁶ The rustic lays of the countrymen grew into a sort of dramatic poetry, which passed from Etruria to Rome.⁷ The numerous Greek colonies in Italy must have diffused some knowledge of the mythology and heroic legends of Greece, and an able writer, who has endeavoured to restore a few specimens of the ballad-poetry of the ancient Romans, considers it 'probable that at an early period Homer and Herodotus furnished some hints to the Latin minstrels.'⁸ But the influence of Greek culture was not fully experienced till

¹ As Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

² Cicero.

³ It is worthy of remark that Plautus repeatedly speaks of his Italian countrymen and his own language as barbarous in comparison with the Greek, which he was imitating.

⁴ See *Varronianus*, p. 439, ed. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 793, foll.

⁶ Niebuhr, *H. R. I.* pp. 254, sqq.; Macaulay, *Lays of Ancient Rome*, pp. 11, sqq.

⁷ *Varronianus*, p. 158.

⁸ Macaulay, *Lays of Ancient Rome*, preface, p. 18.

the war with Pyrrhus brought the victors into direct collision with the orators and poets of Hellas. After Cineas had visited Rome, and after some Latin versifier had done into his own language the epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum, expressing the respect with which the King of Epirus, after the battle of Asculum, in B.C. 280,¹ regarded his before unvanquished enemies, a free imitation of Greek literature became the rule and not the exception with the Latin poets. The old Oscan farces of Atella retained their popularity, either in the original *patois* or in a Latin form, until long after the naturalization of Greek literature at Rome; and Sulla, who did much to favour this transplantation, was known as a writer of Atellanæ in his own Campanian dialect.² But even these native farces were eventually Grecized,³ and all the serious poetry of the Romans was built up on a Greek foundation from the first Punic war downwards. The old Italian metre held its ground down to the time of Nævius, who, besides translating the Cyprian *Iliad*, wrote an epic poem on the first Punic war.⁴ This metre, which is called the Saturnian, is a very rude form of the double *Ithyphallicus* with an *anacrusis*.⁵ There is hardly any nation which has not, in its early days, adopted this simplest of all dancing metres, with its *tripudiatio*, or triple stamp of the foot.⁶ It appears in the oldest laws of Rome,⁷ in the Italian songs,⁸ and even in the Eugubine tables, where it is adapted to the old Umbrian language.⁹ There is no ground, therefore, for Bentley's assumption, that it was borrowed from Greece.¹⁰ Nævius, at all events, regarded it as

¹ Niebuhr, *H. R.* III. note 841; *Varronianus*, p. 228.

² *Varronianus*, p. 132, foll.

³ *Ibid.* p. 138.

⁴ There is an excellent monograph on the fragments of this poem by Vahlen (*Cn. Navi de Bello Punico reliquie*, Lips. 1854). As a specimen of the language and metre, it may be sufficient to quote fragment XVIII. (from Priscian, VI. p. 221, Krehl), which describes the shield of Æneas (Niebuhr, *H. R.* I. p. 192), and in which the *Rhætus* of Horace appears as *Runcus*, and *Porphyrus* as *Purpureus* (Bentley, *ad Horat. Carm.* II. 19, 23):

Ineránt sígna expréssa—quó modó Titáni
Bicórpores Gigántes—mágníque Atlántes
Rúncus ác Purpúreus—fílíí térras.

⁵ *Varronianus*, p. 225.

⁶ Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*, pp. 18, 19.

⁷ Livy, I. 26.

⁸ Varro, *L. L.* VII. § 26.

⁹ *Varronianus*, p. 225.

¹⁰ Macaulay, *u.s.* p. 20.

strictly national, and in the epitaph which he composed for his own monument, he speaks of himself as the last servant of the Latin Camenæ,¹ chiefly, no doubt, because he was the last to write in Saturnian verse. Livius Andronicus, who was a native of Tarentum, introduced translated Greek dramas at Rome in the year B.C. 240,² and in the following year Ennius was born.³ With him the foreign taste fully established itself. Himself half a Greek,⁴ for he was born at Rudiaë, near Brundisium, and thoroughly imbued with a love for Homeric poetry and Pythagorean philosophy,⁵ he formally introduced the Greek metres, and wrote in Latin according to the forms and conventions of Greek poetry. As the *First Punic War* of Nævius was the last poem of the native Latin literature, the *Second Punic War* of Ennius was the first naturalized Greek epos. Ennius was also a tragic poet. He was followed in this by his nephew Pacuvius, who, like Polybius, was a friend of Gaius Lælius.⁶ And he again was succeeded by Attius or Accius, whom Cicero had seen in his youth.⁷ Meanwhile Plautus, who was a contemporary of Ennius, and Terence, who lived in the same literary circle as Pacuvius, had established on the Roman stage the most polished form of the Greek comedy. Besides these adaptations of Greek literature, Italian writers had published histories written in the Greek language. Polybius was himself well acquainted with the Greek *Annals* of Q. Fabius Pictor, who flourished in the middle of the third century B.C., and of L. Cincius Alimentus, who was prætor in 210;⁸ he must have had some knowledge of the *History of Rome* in Greek, by C. Acilius Glabrio, who was quæstor in 203, and whom Livy

¹ Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* I. 24 :

Mortales immortales—flere si forèt fas
Flerènt Divæ Camenæ—Næviùm poëtam
Itaque postquam èst Orcino—tràditùs Thesaurò
Obliti sùnt Románi—loquér Latína língua.

² Cic. *Brut.* 18, § 72 ; Livy VII. 2 ; Aul. Gellius, *N. A.* XVII. 21.

³ Cic. *ibid.*

⁴ Ennius used to say that he had three hearts—i.e., three minds—because he understood the Greek, the Oscan, and the Latin languages. Aul. Gell. *N. A.* XVII. 17.

⁵ See the commentators on Persius, VI. 10.

⁶ Cic. *Lælius*, 7, § 24.

⁷ *Brutus*, 28, § 107 : 'ut ex familiari ejus L. Attio poetâ sum audire solitus.'

⁸ Sir G. C. Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. pp. 36, 37.

quotes for events of the years 212 and 195; and Cn. Aufidius,¹ who was quæstor in B.C. 119, and may therefore have seen Polybius in his youth, consoled himself in old age and blindness by writing a Greek history of his own country.² If, then, Polybius had directed his attention to these facts and tendencies, he might have seen in them an earnest of that supremacy of Greek literature in Rome which was a result as inevitable as the political subjugation of his own country. But these were only the beginnings. The full development followed after the historian's death, and he may have attached as much importance to the anti-Hellenic prejudices of Cato, and to the dismissal of the philosophical ambassadors in B.C. 155, as to the contrary evidence furnished by the popularity of Livius, Ennius, Pacuvius, Plautus, and Terence.

§ 2. The cultivation of Greek literature at Rome must be distinguished from the influence which that literature produced on the compositions of those who wrote in Latin. They both presume a study of the Greek language. But the one manifestation belongs to the history of Roman, the other to that of Greek literature. What we are here concerned with is not so much the relation between the dramatic, epic, and lyric poets of Rome, and their predecessors in the earlier ages of Greece, as with the encouragement which was given at Rome to those who wrote in the Greek language, and the formation of libraries, which, in Rome no less than at Alexandria, tended to create a school of Greek authors. This occurred in the age immediately following that of Polybius. Tiberius Gracchus was born soon after the time when Polybius came as an exile to Rome,³ and, with his brother Gaius, was instructed there by his accomplished mother Cornelia, with the aid of three Greeks, Diophanes of Mytilene, Menelaus of Marathus in Syria,⁴ and Blossius of Cumæ.⁵ The first of these, who was one

¹ Sir G. C. Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. p. 33.

² Cic. *Tusc.* V. 38, § 112; *De Fin.* V. 19, § 54.

³ According to Plutarch (*Vit. Gai Gracchi*, c. 1), he was οὐπω τριάκοντα (ἔτη) γεγονώς at the time of his death in B.C. 133, and was therefore born three or four years after B.C. 167, when Polybius was brought to Rome.

⁴ Menelaus was said to have helped Gaius in the composition of his speeches. Cic. *Brutus*, 26, § 100.

⁵ He was a Stoic and a disciple of Antipater of Tarsus; see Plut. *Tib. Gracchus*,

of the most eminent rhetoricians of his time,¹ became a friend of his pupil, and was put to death by the oligarchs after the fall of Gracchus.² There were other Greeks settled at Rome at this time, and a knowledge of the language became every day a more ordinary accomplishment. In the next generation Sulla, who was born about thirty years after Gracchus, brought from Athens the valuable library of Apellicon of Teos, containing, as we have seen,³ authentic editions of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. And the dictator himself must be counted among the most active patrons of Greek literature at Rome. Lucullus, who followed in the steps of Sulla as a military opponent of Mithridates, spent a part of his wealth in collecting a valuable library, mostly of Greek books,⁴ which, with praiseworthy liberality, he opened to the public.⁵ He was surrounded by Greek literary men, and wrote a history of the Marsic war in Greek.⁶ The philosopher Antiochus was his familiar associate,⁷ and he patronized the poet Archias.⁸ Cicero and his friend Atticus were diligent collectors and readers of Greek books,⁹ and the former not only wrote in Greek himself, but made his countrymen acquainted with the rules of the Greek rhetoricians, and the principles of the philosophic schools of Athens. The plan which Julius Cæsar had formed for the establishment of a public library at Rome,¹⁰ was inaugurated by Asinius Pollio,¹¹ and carried out by Augustus.¹² This library—which was divided into distinct compartments, one for Greek works and the other for Latin, with a

8, p. 827. Cf. Cic. *Læl.* II, § 37; *De Leg. Agr.* II. 34, 93; Valer. Max. IV. 7, § 1.

¹ Cicero, *Brutus*, 27, § 104: 'Græciæ temporibus illis disertissimus;' Strabo, XIII. p. 617.

² Plut. *Vit. Tib. Gracchi*, 8, 20.

³ Above, chapter XL. § 2.

⁴ Isidor. *Origines*, VI. 5, § 1.

⁵ Plut. *Lucull.* 42: ἡ τε χρηστὸς φιλοτιμοτέρα τῆς κτήσεως ἀνειμένων πᾶσι τῶν βιβλιοθηκῶν.

⁶ *Id. ibid.* 1. He did not however profess to be a purist: see Cic. *ad Att.* I. 19, § 10.

⁷ Cic. *Acad.* II. 19, § 61.

⁸ Cic. *pro Archia* 3, 9; *ad Att.* I. 16, 15.

⁹ *Id. ad Att.* I. 7, 10; *Quint. fr.* III. 4.

¹⁰ Sueton. *Cæsar*, 44.

¹¹ Plin. VII. 30, § 210.

¹² Sueton. *August.* 29; Dio. Cassius, LIII. 1.

curator for each—was placed in the colonnades round the temple of Apollo Palatinus, which Augustus erected to commemorate the victory of Actium.¹ He added another library in the Octavian portico, which stood close to the theatre of Marcellus.² Tiberius, Vespasian, Domitian, and Trajan, contributed in different ways to extend these collections of books, some of the earlier libraries having, however, perished in Nero's conflagration.³ And Rome became more and more the rival of Alexandria, both as a receptacle of the best Greek writings, and as a seat of learning in which Greek authors found ready appreciation and efficient patronage.

§ 3. The Greek poets, who were fostered and encouraged at Rome, were chiefly writers of epigrams; and their poems, together with those of older writers, such as Leonidas of Tarentum, and the Alexandrians, are preserved in the collections called *Anthologies*, or 'bouquets of flowers.' The first of these *Anthologies* was called 'the Crown,' and was collected by MELEAGER of Gadara, who flourished about B.C. 60.⁴ He was himself a poet of no little merit, and besides about 130 epigrams, which are still extant, he wrote satirical poems entitled 'the banquet' (συνπόσιον),⁵ 'the mixture of white of egg and lentils' (λεκίθου καὶ φακῆς σύγκρισις),⁶ and 'the Graces' (Χάριτες).⁷ The second of these collections was published by PHILIP of Thessalonica, who flourished in the reign of Tiberius,

¹ Hor. *Epist.* I. 3, 17; Prop. IV. 6, 11; Ovid, *A. A.* III. 389; *Schol. Juven.* I. 128.

² Dio. Cassius, XLIX. 43; Plin. *H. N.* XXXV. 10, XXXVI. 5; Plut. *Marcell.* 30; Sueton. *De Illustr. Gr.* 21. Some remains of it still exist in the *Piazza di Pescheria*.

³ Tacit. *Annal.* XV. 38, 39.

⁴ Strabo, XVI. p. 759; Diog. Laërt. VI. 99; F. Jacobs, *Comment. in Anthol.* I. 1, pp. XXXVIII. sqq; Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 541. It is worthy of observation, that Meleager was so well acquainted with the Semitic dialects, that he could distinguish between the Phœnician and the Syrian. He says (Brunck, *Analecta*, I. p. 37):

ἀλλ' ἐλ μὲν Σύρος ἐσσι σελδμ' ἐλ δ' οὖν σύ γε Φοῖνιξ
αὐδονίς ἐλ δ' Ἑλλήν χαῖρε· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ φράσον.

⁵ Athenæus, XI. p. 502, C.

⁶ *Id.* IV. p. 157, B.

⁷ *Id. ibid.* It has been supposed that all these poems were entitled by the general name of Χάριτες. But the words of Athenæus imply that the two works mentioned together were separate and different publications; he asks: ἡ μόνον ἀνέγνωτε σύγγραμμα αὐτοῦ τὸ περιέχον λ. καὶ φ. σύγκρισιν;

and has left us some fifty epigrams of his own.¹ Other collections of the same kind were made by later poets, and from these and others, which are lost, Agathias in the sixth century, Constantinus Cephalas in the tenth, and Maximus Planudes in the fourteenth, made their anthologies, which were published, the latter in the fifteenth century, the former from a manuscript in the Palatinate library at Heidelberg, in the seventeenth century.²

It would be wearisome to mention the names of all these minor poets. The most notable were the following. ANTI-PATER of Sidon was a Stoic, with whom the orator Crassus was acquainted, probably when quæstor in Macedonia, B.C. 106.³ In spite of an annual fever, he lived to a very advanced age.⁴ He had a faculty of extemporizing in all kinds of metres.⁵ His epigrams in the *Anthology* are chiefly funereal, and his own epitaph was written by Meleager.⁶ The poet ARCHIAS, on whose behalf Cicero delivered his well-known oration in B.C. 61, was a native of Antioch, but came to Rome at a very early age in B.C. 102,⁷ and passed the greater part of his life there, or on foreign service with eminent Romans. He was intimate with Cicero, Metellus Pius, the elder Hortensius, Marius, and Q. Catulus,⁸ but he was more particularly attached to Lucullus, and being adopted by one of the Licinian gens to which that distinguished man belonged, he received the name of *Aulus Licinius*. He was one of the companions of Lucullus in Sicily, in his subsequent exile at Heraclea, in Lucania, and in the Asiatic, African, and Mithridatic wars.⁹ His claim of Roman citizenship was disputed, and it was in his defence, under a charge of illegally assuming the franchise, that Cicero made the celebrated speech *pro Archiâ poetâ*.¹⁰ His works were

¹ Fabric. *Biblioth. Gr.* IV. p. 420, sq. 491, Harl.; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* vol. XIII. p. 934, sqq.

² See below, chapter LX. § 7.

³ Cicero, *De Oratore*, III. 50.

⁴ Plin. *H. N.* VII. § 172; Valer. Max. I. 8.

⁵ Cic. *De Orat.* III. 50, § 194.

⁶ See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. p. 847.

⁷ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 542.

⁸ Cic. *pro Archiâ* 3, 5.

⁹ *Id. ibid.*

¹⁰ This speech was delivered in the old age of Archias (c. 3. § 5, ad fin.), and probably after B.C. 61 (Clinton, u.s. note k). 'Utrum absolutus sit Archias necne,' says Orelli (*Onomast. Tull.* p. 343), 'parum comperimus; illud tamen probabilius, quum iudices in re leviculâ Ciceroni consulari vel propterea gratificari

poems on the Cimbric war of Marius,¹ and the Mithridatic campaign of Lucullus,² on the consulship of Cicero,³ and on his friend Metellus Pius.⁴ It is doubtful whether he lived to complete the last two. He had not begun the panegyric of Cicero in B.C. 61, when he was already an aged man, and his *Cæciliana* is mentioned rather as a projected than as a completed work. About thirty epigrams bear his name: they are not very meritorious, and have been attributed to one or more later writers named Archias. Like Antipater, he was famous as an improvisator.⁵ Cicero's freedman, M. TULLIUS LAUREA,⁶ POLEMON, king of Laodicea and a part of Pontus,⁷ JULIUS POLYÆNUS of Sardis,⁸ are known to us chiefly through their connexion with Cicero, Antony, and Julius Cæsar. We have very few of their epigrams. Some Romans, in the age of Augustus and his successors, obtained a certain reputation as writers of epigrams. The best known of these were ÆLIUS GALLUS,⁹ LOLLIVS BASSUS,¹⁰ GERMANICUS CÆSAR,¹¹ and CN. LENTULUS GÆTULICUS,¹² who was put to death by Caligula. As a whole, the Greek *Anthology* has attracted a great deal of notice, and has perhaps exercised the ingenuity of translators more than nearly any other remains of Greek poetry. It is needless to say that the merits of these short poems are as various as their authors.

Besides these writers of epigrams, the Roman period claims some geographical versifiers, whose position in regard to poetry

debuerint, ne expertes omnis doctrinæ atque humanitatis viderentur, ubi facundam litterarum defensionem respuissent.'

¹ Cic. *pro Archia*, 9.

² *Id. ibid.* 11.

³ Cic. *ad Attic.* I. 16, § 15.

⁴ *Id. ibid.*: 'ac vereor ne Lucullis quoniam Græcum poema condidit nunc ad Cæcilianam fabulam spectet.'

⁵ Cic. *pro Archia*, 8; Quintil. X. 7, § 19.

⁶ Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* IV. p. 498; Jacobs, in *Anthol.* XIII. p. 907.

⁷ His three epigrams are in the *Anthol. Palat.* V. 68; IX. 746; XI. 38. For an account of him, see Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 428, note m.

⁸ *Anthol. Pal.* IX. 1, 7—9. See Suidas, s. v.

⁹ *Anthol. Pal.* V. 49; *Plan.* 89.

¹⁰ There are thirteen of his epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina*. One of these is on the death of Germanicus in B.C. 19 (VII. 391), and so fixes the age of the writer.

¹¹ *Anthol. Pal.* IX. 17, 18, 387.

¹² There are ten epigrams attributed to him in the *Anthology*. It is doubtful, however, whether the writer of these poems was the Latin poet and historian of the age of Tiberius (see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. pp. 475, 476).

is not very different from that of Drayton's *Polyolbion*. The oldest *Periplus* was that of SCYLAX of Caryanda, in Caria,¹ whom some have placed as early as Darius Hystaspes, or as late as Polybius,² and whom Niebuhr has fixed in the time of Philip and Alexander the Great.³ SCYMNUS of Chios, who is supposed to have flourished about 74 B.C., has left us a metrical *Periegesis*, or description of the world, in about 1000 iambic lines. He tells us that he wrote in imitation of the *χρονικά* of Apollodorus, and mentions a number of authorities for his facts.⁴ A similar work, in 1127 hexameters, was written by DIONYSIUS of Charax,⁵ on the Arabian Gulf, whom Augustus sent to the East to chronicle the Parthian and Arabian campaigns, and who is generally known as 'the traveller or gazetteer' (ὁ περιηγήτης). About the same time flourished HELIODORUS, who wrote a poem called 'Italian landscapes' (*Ἰταλικά θεάματα*), from which Stobæus quotes sixteen hexameters.⁶ It described particularly the district of Campania, which lies between Puteoli and the lacus Lucrinus.

¹ Herod. IV. 44, who does not speak of him as a writer.

² See the various opinions quoted by Bähr, *Excursus*, X. *ad Herod. l. c.* vol. III. pp. 671, foll.

³ *Kleine Schriften*, I. pp. 105 sqq. translated and further discussed by Hare in the *Philol. Museum*, I. pp. 245 sqq. At whatever epoch we may agree to fix the *Periplus*, as we now have it, there can be little doubt that we must adopt the view of Letronne (*Journ. d. Sav.* 1826, pp. 75 sqq.), and Müller (*Etrusk.* I. p. 159), that it is a compilation from a variety of sources, drawn up by some writer at least as recent as Alexander, who assumed the name of the oldest and most celebrated coast describer.

⁴ See v. 114—135. As Meineke has shown (*Scymni et Dionysii descriptio Græciæ*, Berolini, 1846), that the genuine Scymnus must have written in prose, it is not improbable that the extant book in verse may have been merely some abridged, and, perhaps, slightly altered, extract from Apollodorus; see Müller, *ad Apollod. Fragmenta*, no. 119.

⁵ Pliny, *H. N.* VI. 141. Bernhardt has made it probable that the extant work was either written or re-edited at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. See Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 576.

⁶ *Florileg.* vol. III. p. 244, in the edition of Meineke (Lipsiæ, 1856), who, however, reads *λατρικῶν θαυμάτων* instead of *Ἰταλικῶν θεάματων*: see his preface, p. XLI. It seems quite uncertain whether this Heliodorus was the same as the rhetor, *Græcorum longe doctissimus*, who accompanied Horace to Brundisium (1 *Serm.* V. 2, 5), and whether he was or was not different from the Athenian *περιηγήτης* of the name, who was one of Pliny's authorities (*H. N.* XXXIII.—XXXV).

A more interesting poet of this age was BABRIUS or BABRIAS, sometimes called GABRIAS,¹ who,² 'at no long time prior to the Augustan age, published a collection of fables under the title of *μῦθοι* or *μυθίαμφοι*,³ from which the fables of Phædrus are closely imitated. They were written in choliambics, and comprised in ten books according to Suidas, or two volumes according to Avienus,⁴ which two accounts are not at variance with each other, as the *books* were doubtless divisions made by the author, like the books of Phædrus, perhaps with an appropriate introduction to each; while the *volumina* of Avienus were probably rolls of parchment or papyrus on which the ten books were written. This poetical collection has not, however, come down to us in a perfect form; and a few fables out of the whole ten books have alone been preserved in different MSS. of the fables attributed to Æsop.' He had models for his versification and in some degree for his language in the halting iambics of Hipponax and Callimachus. From what particular source he derived the fables themselves it is not possible to ascertain, but he had no lack of materials. That the Athenians delighted in this sort of apologues is clear from the allusions in Aristophanes;⁵ and still older specimens are found in Æschylus and Hesiod.⁶ About B.C. 400, Socrates amused himself in his dungeon by versifying Æsop,⁷ and one hundred

¹ Bentley (*Dissertation on the Fables of Æsop*, p. 140) supposed that *Gabrias* and *Babrius* were different persons. He says: 'There is one *Gabrias*, indeed, yet extant, that has comprised each fable in four sorry iambics. But our *Babrius* is a writer of another size and quality.' And Blomfield follows the same opinion (*Mus. Crit.* I. p. 410): 'The fables of *Babrius* were also epitomised by *Gabrias* or *Ignatius*, a monk of the ninth century, into iambic tetrastichs.' It seems clear that the names *Gabrias* and *Babrius* originated in some form, probably Oriental, which began with a sound combining the guttural with the labial.

² These words are from an excellent paper by Sir G. C. Lewis in the *Philological Museum*, I. p. 282. The same scholar has published an edition of *Babrius*.

³ Suidas, s.v.; Avienus, *Præf. Fab.*: 'quas (fabulas) Græcus jam his *Babrius* repetens in duo volumina coarctavit. Phædrus etiam partem aliquam quinque in libellos resolvit.'

⁴ 'It may be farther observed that Avienus calls the books of Phædrus *libelli*, and not *volumina*. In this manner is to be explained the statement of Pliny, *H. N.* VIII. 16, that Aristotle's writings on natural history were contained in nearly fifty *volumina*.' ⁵ e.g. *Vesp.* 1251.

⁶ Æschyl. *Myrmid.* fr. 123, Dind.; Hes. *Op. et Dies.* 200.

⁷ Plat. *Phædo*, p. 61, B.

years later Demetrius Phalereus made a collection of the fables at that time best known and most popular.¹ Perhaps all these, and still more, were accessible to Babrius. His version became the standard edition of these apologues. He found a Latin translator in Phædrus, who was apparently his younger contemporary. Syntipas translated his choliambics into Syriac, and Michael Andreopulus retranslated the Syriac into Greek.² Ignatius Diaconus³ put fifty-three of his fables into *Tetrasticha*, and Maximus Planudes tumbled them into prose, so carelessly that the original choliambic verses may be recognized. It is chiefly from this 'idiot of a monk,' as Bentley calls him,⁴ that the popular fables of modern Europe have been derived.

§ 4. The growing demand for parliamentary and forensic eloquence at Rome would naturally enhance the importance of the theoretical or school rhetoric, which had sprung up during the decline of Greek oratory. As we have already seen, the most eminent Roman orators were formed in the schools of those Greek rhetoricians. Tib. Gracchus had more than one Greek teacher. The Antonius, who is one of the interlocutors in Cicero's great dialogue 'on the orator,' sought instruction from Menedemus.⁵ Cicero himself was trained by APOLLONIUS MOLON⁶ and DEMETRIUS of Syria,⁷ and he placed his son under the care of GORGAS.⁸ The Emperor Augustus was taught by the celebrated APOLLODORUS of Pergamus,⁹ and his successor Tiberius had been a pupil of THEODORUS of Gadara,¹⁰ and of POTAMON, the son of the renowned LESBONAX.¹¹ This popularity of the Greek rhetoric would of course lead to the establishment of the teachers themselves at Rome, and to the publication of

¹ Diog. Laërt. V. 80: λόγων Αἰσωπέων συναγωγή.

² παραδειγματικοὶ λόγοι. ed. Matthæi, Lips. 1781.

³ This was the monk of the ninth century, whom Bentley and Blomfield have invested with the name of Gabrias.

⁴ *Dissert. upon the Fables of Æsop*, p. 147: 'That idiot of a monk has given us a book, which he calls *The Life of Æsop*, that perhaps cannot be matched in any language for ignorance and nonsense.'

⁵ Cic. *De Oratore*, I. 19, § 85.

⁶ *Brutus*, 89, 90, 91.

⁷ *Ibid.* 91, § 315.

⁸ *Id. ad Div.* XVI. 21, § 6; *Plut. Cic.* 24.

⁹ Sueton. *August.* 89; Quintil. II. 11, 2, III. 1, 18, IV. 150.

¹⁰ Quintil. III. 1, §§ 17, 18; Seneca, *Suasor.* III. fin.; Sueton. *Tiber.* 57.

¹¹ Suid. s. v. Ποτάμων.

their works in Italy. Some of these works would be translated into Latin, and we have still a version by Rutilius Lupus of the treatise 'on figures' (περὶ σχημάτων) by Gorgias, the tutor of young Cicero.¹ Other works by the same rhetorician retained their original form, and the two declamations called 'the defence of Palamedes,' and 'the Encomium of Helen,' which have come down to us in the name of the greater Gorgias of Leontini, are probably the compositions of his later namesake. In general, Greek was sufficiently well known among the upper classes to render it worth the rhetorician's while to publish in his own language.² Probably there were few senators or advocates who had not more than one Greek treatise on rhetoric in their libraries. Even in the provinces this was the case, and among the longest of the fragmentary works which have been recovered from the ruins of Herculaneum,³ we have two books of the rhetoric of PHILODEMUS of Gadara, a distinguished Epicurean philosopher and epigrammatist, to whom Cicero refers with much admiration,⁴ and who enjoyed the friendship of the most distinguished men at Rome at that time. The following are the writers on rhetoric whose works seem to have produced the greatest effect at the beginning of the Roman period, and who enjoy the most lasting reputation.

CÆCILIUS of Calacte (καλὴ ἀκτὴ) in Sicily, commonly called CALACTINUS, but sometimes erroneously designated *Callantianus*,⁵ was a Hellenistic Jew, who, like Archias, was naturalized at Rome, and took the name of his patron, one of the Metelli. His Greek name was *Archagathus*.⁶ Although he enjoyed a

¹ Quintil. IX. 2, § 102: 'Rutilius Lupus—Gorgiam secutus, non illum Leontinum, sed alium sui temporis, cujus quatuor libros in unum suum transtulit.' Ruhnken, *Præfat. ad Rutil. Lup.* p. 10. Like the eminent Alexandrians, Gorgias wrote περὶ τῶν Ἀθρήσεων ἐταυρίδων.

² Niebuhr says (*Lectures*, II. p. 264), with his usual outspokenness: 'the Greek literature, which prevailed at Rome in the time of Augustus, was bad; Greek rhetoricians then flocked to Rome, just as French abbés formerly flocked to Germany to teach their language, and they corrupted the Romans and spoiled their taste.'

³ *Antiquit. Hercul.* V. 721; *Volumin. Hercul.* Oxon. 1825, Tom. II.

⁴ *In Pison.* 28, 29. The orator does not mention the name of Philodemus, which, however, is given by Asconius.

⁵ Suid. s.v.; Holsten. ad Steph. Byz. s.v. καλὴ ἀκτὴ; Toup, *ad Longin.* p. 153.

⁶ As the Hebrew מַלְכִי-זְדֵּק, *Malki-Zedek*, corresponds to the Greek Δικαίταρχος,

very high repute at Rome in the time of Cicero and Augustus, and though he is mentioned with the greatest respect by all the subsequent writers who refer to him,¹ his numerous works are all lost, with the exception of a few fragments, so full of judicious and important remarks that we must regret their brevity.² We are also ignorant of the circumstances of his career at Rome. He was distinguished from other Greek rhetoricians by the notice which he took of the great Roman orators, and one of his works was a comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero.³ The list of his writings includes criticisms on the orators,⁴ probably not unlike those of his intimate friend Dionysius, an essay on the genuine and spurious orations of Demosthenes,⁵ a treatise on the difference between the Attic and Asiatic style,⁶ on rhetoric,⁷ on figures,⁸ on the historical accuracy or inaccuracy of the orators,⁹ on the sublime,¹⁰ an alphabetical arrangement of elegant phrases.¹¹ Besides these rhetorical or critical works he wrote a history of the Servile wars,¹² and a work in two books 'against the Phrygians,'¹³ the purport of which is quite unknown.

DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus, who will appear in the next chapter among the historians of this epoch, perhaps owes the

it is probable that the original name of *Archagathus* was מלכי-טוב *Malki-'tu'v*: compare *Achi-'tu'v*, Φιλάγαθος.

¹ Plut. *v. Dem.* 3; Vit. X. *Orat.* pp. 832 E, 833 C, A, 838 D, 840 B; Photius, *Cod.* LXI., CCLIX., CCLX., CCLXII.

² See above, chapter XXXII. § 5.

³ Plut. *v. Dem.* 3: σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος.

⁴ περὶ χαρακτήρος τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων (Suidas), including, as it seems, remarks on certain orators in particular. Writings on Lysias (Longin. *De Sublim.* XXXII. 8) and Antiphon (Plut. p. 832, E), and a comparison of Demosthenes and Æschines (Suidas), are specially mentioned.

⁵ περὶ Δημοσθένους ποῖοι αὐτοῦ γνήσιοι λόγοι καὶ ποῖοι νόθοι (Suidas).

⁶ τίνι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ἥλιος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ (Suid.).

⁷ περὶ ῥητορικῆς (Suid. Quintil. III. 1, § 16. 6. § 48).

⁸ περὶ σχημάτων (Suid.; Alex. *De Figur.* II. 2; Tiber. *De Figur.* 26, 34, 43—48).

⁹ περὶ τῶν καθ' ἱστορίαν ἢ παρ' ἱστορίαν εἰρημένων τοῖς ῥήτορσι (Suid.).

¹⁰ περὶ ὕψους (Longin. *De Sublim.* I. 1).

¹¹ ἀποδείξεις τοῦ εἰρῆσθαι πᾶσαν λέξιν καλλιῤῥήμοσύνης, ἔστι δὲ κατὰ στοιχείου (Eudocia, p. 268). ἐκλογή λέξεων κατὰ στοιχείου (Suid. *præfat.*).

¹² περὶ δονλικῶν πολέμων (Athen. VI. p. 272 E).

¹³ κατὰ Φρυγῶν β (Suid.).

preservation of his rhetorical works to his reputation in another department of literature. Trained in the Asiatic school of rhetoric, he came to Rome in B.C. 29, when he was about twenty-five years old,¹ and remained there to the end of his life in B.C. 7. Although his chief occupation during these twenty-two years was the study of Roman history and the composition of his great work, the *Roman Archæology*, he did not neglect his profession as a teacher of rhetoric,² and published a number of treatises of the same description as those of his friend and contemporary Cæcilius. It is not improbable that he had the Roman franchise, and bore a Roman name, like Archias and Archagathus: but we have no information on this subject. His rhetorical works are as follows:—

(a) ‘On the arrangement of words’ (περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων), dedicated to Melitius Rufus, the son of one of his most valued friends.³ This work was probably published soon after his arrival at Rome. It is not improbable that it was composed for the use of a Roman, in whose house the rhetorician was established as the tutor of his son, and who may have been his patron. In this case, the Roman name of Dionysius might be recoverable. But, unfortunately, it is not certain whether the *nomen* of Rufus was *Melitius*, *Minucius*, or *Metellus*.⁴ If the latter, Dionysius was a Cæcilius, like Archagathus, and the dropping of his Roman name would be thus accounted for.

(b) ‘On the art of rhetoric’ (τέχνη ῥητορική), in twelve, or, according to another arrangement, in eleven chapters, dedicated to Echebrates. It is known that Dionysius wrote a book with this title,⁵ but the work so called, if it deserves a single title,

¹ Diony. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I. 7; Phot. *Cod.* LXXXIII.; Suid. s.v.; Dodwell, *Dissert. De ætate Dion. Hal. apud Reiskium*, I. pp. XLVI.—LXII.; Clinton, *F. H.* III. pp. 229, 253.

² He was probably a teacher long before he came to Rome, and his professional employments there may be inferred from many passages in his works: see *De Comp. Verb.* 20; *Rhet.* 10, &c.

³ *De Comp. Verb.* 1: πατὴρ ἀγαθοῦ κάμοι τιμωτάτου φίλων.

⁴ The readings (p. 3, Reiske) are ‘Ροῦφε Μελίτιε and ‘Ροῦφε Μελίτιε. Sylburg proposed Μενύκτιε on account of the cognomen *Rufus*. But this cognomen was found among the *Rutilii*, *Sulpicii*, *Pompeii*, *Egnatii*, *Sextilii*, *Vibullii*, *Helvidii*, and *Helvii*, and as Ellendt remarks (*De Cogn. et Agn. Rom.* p. 19): ‘posterior ætate id cognomen latissime patet, quia sumebantur pro lubitu nec perpetua.’

⁵ Quintil. *I. O.* III. 1, § 16.

should rather be termed 'rules for different kinds of speeches' (μέθοδοι πανηγυρικῶν, &c.). The treatise, as we have it, is not a complete work, but a collection of fragments, some manifestly of later date than Dionysius. In fact, the only chapters which bear internal resemblance to his style and agree with his principles, are the eighth, 'on figurative language' (περὶ ἐσχηματισμένων), and the tenth, 'on the faults in set speeches' (περὶ τῶν ἐν μελέταις πλημμελουμένων), of which the ninth and eleventh respectively are supplements by later hands. The first seven chapters have a certain unity of subject, and may have proceeded from some writer of the second century, for they contain a mention of Nicostratus,¹ who was a contemporary of Aristides and Dion Chrysostomus. The twelfth chapter, 'on the examination or criticism of speeches' (περὶ λόγων ἐξετάσεως), is clearly a detached tract by some unknown writer.

(c) 'The judgment of the ancients' (τῶν ἀρχαίων κρίσις) or 'the characteristics of old writers' (τῶν παλαιῶν χαρακτῆρες) seems to be merely an epitome of a larger work, now lost, entitled 'commentaries on imitation' (ὑπομνηματισμοὶ περὶ τῆς μιμήσεως). It contains brief remarks on a considerable number of poets, historians, philosophers, and orators.

(d) 'Commentaries on the Attic orators' (περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ῥητόρων ὑπομνηματισμοί). Of this work, originally published in six parts, we have only the first three relating to Lysias, Isocrates, and Isæus. Of the chapter on Demosthenes we have only one section, generally entitled² 'on the power of the style of Demosthenes' (περὶ τῆς λεκτικῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος). The rest of this chapter and the two on Hypereides and Æschines are lost. It is not certain whether he added any chapter on the historians.

(e) As a supplement to this work, we have a monograph 'on Deinarchus,' whom he did not think worthy of a place in his criticisms on the greater orators, because he was neither an originator nor a perfecter of the improvements introduced by others.³

¹ Dionys. *Ars Rhetor.* c. 2, p. 242, Reiske.

² This title is not found in the MSS., but appears in all the editions subsequent to Sylburg's.

³ *De Dinarcho judicium*, p. 629, Reiske: διὰ τὸ μήτε εὐρετὴν ἰδίου γεγονέναι

(f) Two epistles to Ammæus, one 'on Demosthenes and Aristotle,' in which he shows that the orator did not form his style on the precepts of Aristotle, having, in fact, composed most of his speeches before the publication of that philosopher's *Rhetoric*; the other 'on the peculiarities of Thucydides' (περὶ τῶν Θουκυδίδου ἰδιωμάτων), in which he treats of the oratorical character of that historian.

(g) The last-named tract was written before the letter to Q. Ælius Tubero 'on the character of Thucydides and the other peculiarities of the historian' (περὶ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου χαρακτήρος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ συγγραφέως ἰδιωμάτων), which extends what Dionysius had said in his book περὶ μιμήσεως.¹ His criticisms on Thucydides are conceived merely in a rhetorical spirit, and he does not do much justice to the special merits of that great writer.

(h) His 'letter to Cn. Pompey' (ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Γν. Πομπήϊον) is in reply to one from a Greek rhetorician of that name, who had probably been a freedman or client of the great Pompey,² and who had written to tax Dionysius with drawing an unfair comparison between Plato and Demosthenes. Dionysius defends his own view of the matter, and also enters into details respecting the historians. This part of the letter is somewhat mutilated, and it is not impossible that it may have been a detached fragment.

Besides these works, the following are mentioned: (a) *χαρακτῆρες τῶν ἀρμονιῶν*;³ (b) *πραγματεία ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτικῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς τοὺς κατατρέχοντας αὐτῆς ἀδίκως*.⁴ And he seems to have intended to write treatises 'on the figures of speech in Plato and Demosthenes'⁵ and 'on the choice of words'⁶ What we have enables us to see that Dionysius deserves to be

χαρακτῆρος τὸν ἄνδρα, ὥσπερ τὸν Λυσίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰσοκράτην καὶ τὸν Ἰσαίον, μήτε τῶν εὐρημένων τελειώτην, ὥσπερ τὸν Δημοσθένην καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην καὶ Ἱππερίδην ἡμεῖς κρίνομεν.

¹ See pp. 811, sqq., Reiske.

² It is not impossible that this Cn. Pompeius was no less a person than the historian Cn. Pompeius Theophanes, who will be mentioned in the next chapter.

³ Dion. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 11. Some fragments of this work have been published by Mai.

⁴ *Id. Judic. de Thucy.* 2.

⁵ *Id. De Demosth.* 32.

⁶ *Id. De Comp. Verb.* 1.

placed in the first rank of ancient critics. His judgments are acute and intelligent. He is unusually well-informed in the literature of his country, and he fully understands the principles of his own art. But he is deficient in philosophical spirit and in wide and comprehensive views respecting the different departments of literary labour. He had probably confined himself to rhetoric at the time when he wrote most of these works; at any rate, he approaches his subject with the prejudices of a rhetorical schoolman by profession; and he is unjust to great authors like Thucydides and Plato for the same reason which made him prone to exaggerate, if this was possible, the merits of Demosthenes.

In the time of Augustus there was a flourishing school of rhetoric at Mytilene, in which TIMOCRATES,¹ his pupil LESBONAX,² and POTAMON,³ the son of the latter, taught with great reputation. The second of these, according to Suidas, wrote 'rhetorical exercises' and 'erotic epistles;' and sixteen political orations are attributed to him by other writers. We have still two declamations bearing his name—'on the war of the Corinthians,' and 'a hortatory speech,'⁴—which are not very successful imitations of the Attic orators. In the former, which has really nothing to do with the Corinthians, the rhetorician supposes himself to be urging the Athenians to take vengeance on Thebes; in the latter, he encourages them to a vigorous prosecution of the war with the Spartans.

At the same period there were rival schools of rhetoric in Rhodes and at Pergamus. The latter called themselves 'Apollodorians,' from APOLLODORUS, the teacher of Augustus; the former 'Theodorians,' from THEODORUS of Gadara, the teacher of Tiberius.⁵ Theodorus was a voluminous writer, and Dion Chrysostomus mentions his name among those of the more recent writers (τῶν νεωτέρων καὶ ὀλίγων πρὸ ἡμῶν), whose

¹ Lucian, *De Salt.* 69.

² Suidas, s.v. Λεσβῶναξ; Photius, *Cod.* LXXIV. p. 52 a.

³ Suid. s. v. Ποτάμων.

⁴ Πολιτικός περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τῶν Κορινθίων (Bekker, *Oratores Attici*, vol. V. pp. 3—5): προτρεπτικός (*Id. ibid.* pp. 5—15). The second μελέτη is divided into two portions.

⁵ Strabo, XIII. p. 625, XVI. p. 759.

works demand some attention from all who wish to cultivate eloquence.¹ He settled eventually at Rome, where he carried on a controversy with Potamon and Antipater.² He has the credit of the remark that Tiberius was 'a mass of clay mixed up with blood.'³ His son Antonius became a senator under Hadrian.²

DIDYMUS, surnamed *Chalcenterus* (Χαλκέντερος), from his indefatigable industry,⁴ and *Bibliolathas* (Βιβλιολάθας), from his inability to recollect the whole of his own multifarious writings,⁵ was an Alexandrian grammarian and critic of the school of Aristarchus, and flourished in the time of Augustus.⁶ That he was ever settled at Rome does not appear. But he had literary relations with that capital, for he wrote a book against the *Republic* of Cicero,⁷ which at a later period gave rise to a reply from Suetonius.⁸

APOLLONIDES of Nicæa, who, like Didymus, wrote on proverbs,⁹ and was the author of some well-known scholia on Demosthenes,¹⁰ is connected with the Greek literature of Rome by a commentary on the *Silli* of Timon, which he dedicated to Tiberius.¹¹

§ 5. Two branches of Greek philosophy, the Epicurean and the Stoic, were cultivated to a considerable extent at Rome, and the new Academy found at least one able advocate and exponent in Cicero. It does not belong to our subject to discuss the Latin works in which these Greek systems were explained and recommended. The Epicureans APOLLODORUS CEPOTYRANNUS, ZENO of Sidon, PHÆDRUS, PATRON, and PHILISCUS, are known to us merely at second-hand. Besides the rhetorical treatise already mentioned, and one on music, PHILODEMUS of Gadara, who was the most distinguished

¹ Dion Chrysost. oratio XVIII. *De Dicendi Exercitatione*, I. p. 283, Dindorf.

² Suid. s.v. Θεόδωρος.

³ Sueton. *Tiber.* 57: 'subinde in objurgando appellans eum πηλὸν αἵματι πεφυραμένον.'

⁴ *Id.* s.v. Δίδυμος: Χαλκέντερος κληθεὶς διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ βιβλία ἐπιμονήν: Athen. IV. p. 139, C: καλεῖ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ Δημήτριος ὁ Τροιζήνιος βιβλιολάθαν.

⁵ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος ὧν ἐκδέδωκε συγγραμμάτων (cf. Quintil. I. 8, § 19). Athenæus (*l.c.*) attributes to him 3500, and Seneca (*Ep.* 88) 4000 different works.

⁶ Suid. s.v.: ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κικέρωνος καὶ ἕως Αὐγούστου.

⁷ Ammian. Marcell. XXII. 16.

⁸ Suidas, s.v. Τράγκυλλος.

⁹ Steph. Byz. s.v. Τερνα.

¹⁰ Ammon, s.v. ὀφλεῖν.

¹¹ Diog. Laërt. IX. 109.

Epicurean of the age of Cicero, is represented by a book 'on the virtues and vices,' which has been discovered among the ruins of Herculaneum. Of PHILO and ANTIOCHUS, who taught their academic theories at Rome, we have already spoken.¹ The capital produced no original and influential representative of Greek philosophy till the reign of Nero, when GAIUS MUSONIUS RUFUS taught and wrote in defence of Stoicism, and, as it seems, chiefly in Greek.² The same views were advocated by L. ANNÆUS CORNUTUS,³ a freedman of Seneca, from Leptis in Africa, who taught the doctrines of his patron and friend to the poets Persius and Lucan, the former of whom has immortalized him.⁴ Cornutus certainly wrote in Greek, and one of his treatises is still extant in a mutilated form.⁵ Another Stoic of this period was EUPHRATES, of whom Pliny gives a very flattering account.⁶ But the most eminent of these Græco-Roman Stoics was EPICTETUS,⁷ originally the slave of Epaphroditus, Nero's confidential freedman. He was a native of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and was converted to the doctrines of the Porch, before he gained his freedom, by Musonius and Euphrates. This was after Musonius returned from exile under Galba—perhaps when he was enjoying the favour of Vespasian. Epictetus was sufficiently prominent as a teacher of philosophy in Domitian's reign to be included in the sentence of banishment which drove all philosophers from Rome. He settled for the remainder of his life at Nicopolis in Epirus,

¹ Above, chapter XLVII. § 8.

² See Suidas, s. v. Μουσώνιος, which article seems to be an extract from Eunapius. Photius, *Cod.* CCXLIII.; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* VII. 16. There are many extracts from his writings in Stobæus. Although a native of Volsinii in Etruria, his connexions were chiefly Greek, and his daughter was married to the philosopher Artemidorus, who is so highly extolled by Pliny (*Epist.* III. 11).

³ Valesius, ad Euseb. *H. E.* VI. 19, p. 206, Heinichen; Martini, *Disputatio Litteraria de L. Annæo Cornuto*, Lugd. Bat. 1825; Suid. s. v.

⁴ In his fifth satire.

⁵ It is entitled *θεωρία περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν φύσεως*, or (according to Martini, *u. s.* p. 80) merely *περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν φύσεως*. To this probably Theodoret alludes when he says: Κορνοῦτος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν θεολογίαν συντέθεικε.

⁶ Plin. *Epist.* I. 10. He is also mentioned by Arrian (*Epict.* III. 15, IV. 8), and M. Aurelius (X. 31). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* III. pp. 173, 562, Harl.

⁷ Suidas, s. v.; Aulus Gellius, *N. A.* II. 18, XVII. 19; Arrian, *Epict.* I. 9, 29; Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* V. pp. 64, sqq. Harl.; Gataker, *ad M. Aurel.* I. 7, VII. 29.

and devoted himself to the systematic teaching of a very consistent development of the Stoic philosophy. He did not leave anything of his own in writing, but his pupil Arrian took down his lectures, when he was a very old man,¹ and we have thus a sufficiently complete exposition of his doctrines, which teach a reliance on providence, and the strictest obligations of moral duty. There is no reason to believe that these later Stoics had become acquainted with Christianity, but there are many sentiments in Epictetus and Persius which are in accordance with the doctrines of our religion, and the former has long been a popular authority with modern moralists. Stoicism, however, did not always produce at Rome the moral results so conspicuous in Musonius, Cornutus, and Epictetus. It was sometimes assumed, like the Puritanism of the seventeenth century, as a cloak of maliciousness, perfidy, and sordid avarice,² and Musonius himself was obliged to accuse a brother Stoic of this class, P. EGNATIUS CELER,³ who had acted as a base informer against his own friend and pupil, the excellent BAREAS SORANUS.⁴ The Stoic HELIODORUS similarly impeached LICINIUS SILANUS.⁵

A sort of revival of the Pythagorean system belongs to this period. Its representatives were QUINTUS SEXTIUS, a contemporary of Julius Cæsar, who wrote a Greek manual (Ἐγχειρίδιον), of which we have a Latin translation by Rufinus;⁶ SOTION of Alexandria, from whom Seneca received instruction;⁷

¹ See below, chapter LIV. § 2.

² See the description which Tacitus gives of Egnatius, *Annal.* XVI. 32.

³ Dio. Cassius, LXII. 26.

⁴ Tac. *Annal.* XVI. 21. Egnatius was a Greek, and a native of the same city as his contemporary, the Apostle Paul. Juvenal says with his usual vigour (III. 114, sqq.):

Et quoniam cœpit Græcorum mentio, transi
Gymnasia, atque audi facinus majoris abollæ.
Stoicus occidit Baream, delator amicum,
Discipulumque senex, ripa nutritus in illa,
Ad quam Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi.

⁵ Schol. *ad Juv.* I. 33.

⁶ Seneca, *Ep.* 64, c; *De Ira*, II. 36, III. 36, &c.

⁷ *Id.* *Ep.* 108. His treatise on Anger (*περὶ ὀργῆς*) is quoted several times by Stobæus (I. pp. 237, 312, IV. 41, 66, ed. Meineke).

MODERATUS of Gades,¹ a contemporary of Nero,² who wrote on the system of Pythagoras;³ SECUNDUS of Athens, who has left a few 'sentences' (γνῶμαι), in the form of questions and answers;⁴ and APOLLONIUS of Tyana in Cappadocia, whose marvellous career and sham miracles have furnished more than one enemy of Christianity with ammunition for the artillery of unbelief.⁵

Some of the later Stoics, such as DEMETRIUS the friend of Seneca,⁶ and DEMONAX of Cyprus, the pupil of Epictetus,⁷ were regarded as having fallen back on the Cynicism of which Stoicism was, as we have seen, a partial representative. CENOMAUS of Gadara, in the reign of Hadrian, was distinguished as a writer.⁸ At a somewhat later period, one of these Cynics, PEREGRINUS PROTEUS of Parus, on the Hellespont, performed an exploit which Lucian has commemorated in a special tract. He burned himself alive, either in the vanity of madness, or in the folly of enthusiasm.⁹

¹ Steph. Byzant. s.v. Γάδερα. The citation of Suidas is a mistake of Fabricius, followed by Mr. Mason in Smith's *Dict.* s.v.

² His scholar Lucius was a contemporary of Plutarch, *Sympos.* VIII. 7, p. 727 B, p. 999, Wytttenb.

³ Porphy. *Vita Plotin.* p. LXXII. ed. Creuzer; *De Vita Pythag.* § 48, p. 46 Küster; ἐν ἑνδεκα βιβλίοις; Stobæus, *Eclog. Phys.* I. 2, 8, p. 18, Heeren; Valesius, *ad Euseb. H. E.* VI. 19.

⁴ Fabricius I. pp. 866—870. He was also known as a rhetorician, and as the teacher of Herodes Atticus. Suidas (s.v. Σεκοῦνδος) says he was also called Πλήμιος, i.e. *Plinius*, so that he may have been a freedman of that family.

⁵ See the papers 'on the later Ages of Heathen Philosophy' (attributed to Professor Malden) in Knight's *Quarterly Magazine*, II. pp. 172, sqq.

⁶ Seneca, *Dialog.* X. 14. 5, *Nat. Qu.* IV., *Præf.* 7, *Ep.* 67, 14, &c.

⁷ Lucian, *Demonactis Vita* passim.

⁸ Suid. s.v.; Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* V. 18—21, VI. 7; Theodore, *De Græc. Affect.* p. 86, 22; Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, pp. 151, sqq.

⁹ Below, chapter LIV. § 3.

CHAPTER LI.

LEARNED HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY UNDER THE CÆSARS.

§ 1. Historians whose works are lost: Castor, Theophanes, Timagenes, Juba, Nicolaus, and Poseidonius. § 2. The Universal History of Diodorus. § 3. The Roman Archæology of Dionysius. § 4. The Jewish Archæology of Josephus. § 5. The continuation of Polybius by Strabo. His general geography based on that of Eratosthenes.

§ 1. **O**F the Greek writers who flourished under Roman patronage in the time of the Cæsars, by far the most important were the historians and geographers. The great extent of the Roman empire, which was always advancing its borders, and bringing under its influence nations previously unknown, created a constant demand for an account of these peoples, and a description of their countries. And Greek was still the established vehicle for literary communications on these subjects. When Tacitus wrote his account of the Germans, as an appendix to his book of histories,¹ he was giving an account of tribes better known to the Romans than to the Greeks; but for general researches, especially with regard to the old world and the East, the field was claimed by the Greeks as peculiarly their own; the same was the case with regard to general history, or the memoirs of those to whom Greek was vernacular; and in one particular case, that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek undertook to expound the early history of the invincible Romans themselves. Confining ourselves, for the present, to those who wrote in the times of the twelve Cæsars, we shall have to discuss in the present chapter four authors, whose literary activity is still represented by very considerable remains—the traveller and historical compiler Diodorus, who undertook to draw up an universal history from the earliest times to

¹ Ritter Proœmium, *ad suam Tacit. Edit.* p. XVIII. : ‘ego tamen certissime mihi videor intellexisse Germaniam nihil esse nisi Historiarum appendicem (*ein Beiwerk zu den Historien*), quem excursus nos dicimus.’

the Gallic wars of Julius Cæsar; the rhetorician Dionysius, who wrote an elaborate history of Rome from its legendary beginnings to the year B.C. 264, when Polybius commences the history of the Punic wars; the Jewish chieftain Josephus, who endeavoured to do for his own countrymen what Dionysius had attempted for the Romans, and also described the wars which had led to the final capture of Jerusalem; and the great traveller and historian Strabo, who, besides a continuation of Polybius, now lost, wrote a most valuable treatise on geography, which has, with few exceptions, come down to us entire. Before, however, we pass on to a review of these important works, we must notice a few of the minor authors belonging to the present period, or to the age immediately preceding it.

A number of historical, chronological, and rhetorical works are referred to CASTOR of Rhodes, of Massilia, or of Galatia,¹ about whose identity there is no little difficulty. In the first place, Apollodorus refers in his *Bibliotheca*² to one of the works attributed to this Castor. But Apollodorus flourished about 140 B.C., whereas Castor is said to have been the son-in-law of Deiotarus, the Galatian king, who was a contemporary of Julius Cæsar. Either, therefore, Apollodorus is referring to an older writer of the name, to whom the chronological work in question ought to be ascribed, or the *Bibliotheca* has come down to us in some later edition. The Castor, of whom Suidas speaks, is called 'the friend of the Romans' (Φιλορωμαῖος), a name which he acquired by his services in the last war with Mithridates.³ Strabo speaks of a palace in Galatia belonging to Castor Saocondarius,⁴ whom, being his son-in-law, Deiotarus slew, together with

¹ The following is the article in Suidas: Κάστωρ, 'Ρόδιος, ἡ, ὡς τινες, Γαλάτης' ὡς δὲ ἄλλοι ἐπλανήθησαν, Μασσαλιώτης, ῥήτωρ· δς ἐκλήθη Φιλορωμαῖος. Γήμας δὲ οὗτος Δηϊοτάρου τοῦ συγκλητικοῦ θυγατέρα, ἀνηρέθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἅμα τῇ γαμετῇ, διότι αὐτὸν Καίσαρι διέβαλεν. ἔγραψε δὲ Ἀναγραφὴν Βαβυλῶνος καὶ τῶν θαλασσοκρατησάντων, ἐν βιβλίοις β', Χρονικὰ ἀγνοήματα, καὶ Περὶ ἐπιχειρημάτων ἐν βιβλίοις ε', Περὶ πειθοῦς β', Περὶ τοῦ Νείλου, Τέχνην ῥητορικὴν (Walz. *Rhet. Gr.* III. p. 712, sqq.), καὶ ἕτερα. To these works must be added 'χρονικὰ or χρονογραφία, *libris* VI. published after B.C. 56. Euseb. *Chron.* I. 13, p. 36.' Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 546.

² II. i, § 3.

³ Appian, *De bello Mithrid.* c. 114.

⁴ XII. p. 568: οἷς ἐστὶ τὸ Γόρδιον καὶ Γορβειοῦς τὸ τοῦ Κάστορος βασιλείον τοῦ Σαωκονδάρου, ἐν ᾧ γαμβρὸν ὄντα τοῦτον ἀπέσφαξε Δηϊόταρος καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τὴν αὐτοῦ.

his own daughter ; and Suidas tells us that Castor, the son-in-law of Deiotarus, denounced (διέβαλεν) that prince to Julius Cæsar, and was in consequence put to death by him. But it appears that it was the grandson of Deiotarus, also called Castor, who laid this charge against him, and so incurred his vengeance.¹ The only way of reconciling these discrepancies is to suppose that Castor the historian was a native of Phanagoria,² raised to opulence by Deiotarus, and honoured with the hand of that king's daughter ; that he had the surname Saocondarius, or was perhaps the same as the Tarcondarius Castor mentioned by Cæsar ;³ that his son Castor accused his maternal grandfather, and that the vengeance of the Gallo-Græcian king fell on the whole family.⁴ On this supposition we shall be content to assign to the Philo-Roman the work 'on those who have gained the empire of the sea,' and to leave to an older Castor, a native of Rhodes, and to a later writer of the same name, a Massaliote, the rhetorical and geographical works, and the books on the errors of chronology mentioned by Apollodorus.

As Castor was brought through Deiotarus into contact with Julius Cæsar, CN. POMPEIUS THEOPHANES of Mytilene appears as the friend and adviser of Pompey,⁵ who gave him the Roman franchise,⁶ and whose memoirs he wrote while the subject of them was still alive. Strabo calls him the most distinguished of the Greeks of his time,⁷ with reference perhaps to his political importance, no less than to his literary eminence. His counsels to Pompey were very disastrous. It was he who, after the battle of Pharsalia, recommended the defeated general to seek a refuge in Egypt instead of flying to Parthia.⁸ But, however mistaken, his advice was doubtless sincere, and perhaps

¹ Cicero, *pro Deiotaro*, I, § 2 ; 10, § 28.

² Appian, *l. l.* c. 108 : Κάστωρ Φαναγορεύς.

³ Cæsar, *Bell. Civ.* III. 4, where the common reading is *Tarcondarius*, probably suggested by the name of the Cilician chieftain *Tarcondimotus*, who fought on the other side.

⁴ Deiotarus Philadelphus, the grandson of the historian and great-grandson of the king, afterwards reigned in Paphlagonia ; Strabo, XII. p. 562.

⁵ Cæsar, *Bell. Civ.* III. 18 ; Strabo, XIII. p. 617 ; Cic. *Att.* II. 5, § 1 ; IX. 1.

⁶ Cic. *pro Archid.*, 10, § 24 : 'Cn. Pompeius Theophanem, scriptorem rerum suarum, in contione militum civitate donavit.' Valer. Max. VIII. 14, § 3.

⁷ pp. 617, 618 : ἐαυτὸν πάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐπιφανέστατον ἀνέδειξεν.

⁸ Plut. *Pomp.* 76, 78.

his embassy to the court of Auletes in B.C. 59 had inspired him with false hopes respecting his own influence in that country and the favourable disposition of Ptolemy. After his death he received divine honours from his countrymen,¹ on whom Pompey had conferred great benefits on his account.² His son was called Marcus Pompeius, and was procurator in Asia under Augustus.³ The family succumbed ultimately to the jealousy of Tiberius, and were compelled to put themselves to death.⁴

TIMAGENES of Alexandria, son of the banker (βασιλικὸς ἀργυραμοιβός) of Ptolemy Auletes, became a slave when the city was taken by Gabinius, B.C. 55, and was sold to Faustus, the son of the dictator Sulla.⁵ His first menial office was that of cook; then he became one of the bearers of his master's litter.⁶ At last his literary talents, and his great powers of conversation, made themselves known. He obtained his freedom, and set up as a teacher of rhetoric with eminent success. The reputation which he acquired recommended him to the friendship of Augustus, who selected him for the office of court biographer. But his unhappy wit led him to offend the emperor in one of his sallies of sarcastic raillery, and he was forbidden the palace. In his spite he burned the work which he had commenced, and retired from Rome to Tusculum, where he found a retreat in the house of Asinius Pollio.⁷ Here after a while he resumed his historical labours,⁸ but did not take Augustus or Roman affairs for his subject. He wrote a work with the title 'on kings' (περὶ βασιλείων), which was in fact an account of Alexander and his successors, and furnished Q. Curtius with some of his best materials.⁹ Towards the end of his life he retired to Mesopotamia, and died at Dabana in Osroene.¹⁰ On account

¹ Tacit. *Annal.* VI. 18.

² Plut. *Pomp.* 42: εἰς Μιτυλήνην ἀφικόμενος τὴν πόλιν ἡλευθέρωσε διὰ Θεοφάνην.

³ Strabo, XII. p. 618.

⁴ Tacit. *u. s.*

⁵ Suid. *s. v.*

⁶ M. Seneca, *Controv.* 34: 'ex coquo lecticarius, ex lecticario usque ad amicitiam Cæsaris felix.'

⁷ Horace, *Epist.* I. 19, 15; L. Seneca, *Dial.* V. 23, 4—8. Cf. Plut. *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur*, p. 68 B.

⁸ Quintil. X. 1, § 75.

⁹ Q. Curtius, IX. 21, § 21; Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Μιλύας; Plut. *Pomp.* 49; Joseph. *in Apion.* II. 6.

The old reading in Suidas, *s. v.* is: ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐν 'Αλβάνῳ ἐμέσαι βουλό-

of this residence in the East, he is sometimes called 'a Syrian.'¹ Besides the book 'on kings,' he wrote a *Periplus*, and a history of the Gauls. In his case, as in that of Castor, it has been supposed that the historian has been confused with one or more persons of the same name.²

JUBA II., king of Mauretania, was a very voluminous writer, and is called by Plutarch 'the most historical of all kings.'³ He laid the foundations of his learning and literary tastes during his long residence at Rome, where he spent all his earlier years in honourable captivity. At the death of his father in B.C. 46, Juba was a mere boy, but was taken to Rome to adorn the triumph of Julius Cæsar.⁴ He was subsequently treated with much kindness and consideration, was well educated, and not only enjoyed the advantage of literary intercourse with the most eminent literary men of the day, but also gained the favour of Augustus, who married him to Cleopatra Selene, the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, and restored to him a considerable portion of his father's dominions in Africa.⁵ It is inferred that he died not later than A.D. 18 or 19.⁶ His works were :⁷ (a) a history of Rome from the earliest ages down to the civil wars ;⁸ (b) two books on the Assyrians, in which he made use of Berosus ;⁹ (c) a valuable history of Libya ;¹⁰ (d) a history of the stage, in at least seventeen books ;¹¹ (e) a treatise

μενος μετὰ δέλπνον, καὶ σφηνωθείς, (*vid.* Suid. s. h. v.). But both Hemsterhuis and Toup read ΑΑΒΑΝΩΙ for ΔΑΒΑΝΩΙ.

¹ *Anonym. de Fluviiis*, 6.

² See Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 624 ; Smith's *Dictionary*, s. v. p. 1131.

³ *Sertor.* 9 : ὁ πάντων ιστορικώτατος βασιλέων.

⁴ Appian. *Bell. Civ.* II. 101 ; Plut. *Cæs.* 55.

⁵ Dio. Cassius, LI. 15 ; LIII. 26 ; LV. 28 ; Plut. *Anton.* 87 ; Strabo, XVII. pp. 828, 831. Hence Horace, (1 *Carm.* 22, 15), calls Mauretania 'Jubæ tellus.'

⁶ He is mentioned as lately dead by Strabo (XVII. p. 828 : 'Ιούβας μὲν οὖν νεωστὶ ἐτελεύτα τὸν βίον) who was writing about A.D. 17. Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 203.

⁷ See Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 551.

⁸ *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία*, Steph. Byz. s. v. *Νομαντία*.

⁹ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 392, Potter : 'Ιόβας δὲ περὶ Ἀσσυρίων γράφων ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἱστορίαν παρὰ Βηρώσου εἰληφέναι. Simil. Tatian, *Or. ad Græc.* p. 127.

¹⁰ περὶ Λιβύης συγγράμματα, Athen. III. p. 83 B. This work is constantly quoted, or tacitly referred to, by Pliny and others.

¹¹ *Θεατρικὴ ἱστορία*, Athen. IV. p. 175 D ; Phot. *Cod.* CLXI.

on painters, in at least eight books;¹ (*f*) two botanical essays on *euphorbia* and *opium*;² (*g*) an essay on the corruption of style, in at least two books;³ (*h*) a tract called ὁμοιότητες, which seems to have been a comparison of synonymous words in Greek and Latin.⁴ He also wrote epigrams, one of which has been preserved. If it is a fair specimen, he did not rank high even among royal poets. His prose works, however, had considerable merit and value. Pliny made great use of his history of Libya, and his Roman history was a favourite authority with Plutarch.

NICOLAS of Damascus, the friend of Augustus and Herod the Great, was a very eminent and influential person, and many anecdotes are told about him, some of them being derived from his autobiography,⁵ a portion of which has been preserved.⁶ Besides this, he wrote a general history in 144 books;⁷ lives of Augustus and Herod;⁸ a treatise on singular usages (παράδοξων ἔθων συναγωγή);⁹ some tragedies, of which one was called (Σωσανίς) *Sosanis* or *Sosannes*, i.e. *Susannah*,¹⁰ and some comedies, from one of which we have a fragment in forty-five

¹ περὶ γραφικῆς or περὶ ζωγράφων. Harpocraton, s. νν. Παῤῥάσιος, Πολύγνωτος.

² Plin. *H. N.* XXV. § 77 sq.: 'Juba rex patrum nostrorum ætate invenit herbam quam appellavit *Euphorbeum* medici sui nomine, exstatque ejus volumen de eâ herbâ.' Cf. V. § 16. The treatise περὶ ὀποῦ (Galen II. p. 297), seems to have been on the *meconium* in particular (*opium vocant* Plin. *H. N.* XX. 18, § 199), though ὀπός, besides its general meaning, was sometimes specially the juice of the silphium (Galen. *De Simpl. Med. Fac.* 8).

³ ἐν β' περὶ φθορᾶς λέξεως. Suid. s. v. σκομβρίσαι.

⁴ There is a sample of it in Athen. IV. p. 170 E, where τραπεζοκόμος is proved to be an equivalent for the Latin *structor* by a passage from the Πότος of Alexander.

⁵ περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου καὶ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ἀγωγῆς, Suidas, s. v., whose account is supported by Valesius to be derived from this book.

⁶ *Excerpt. Peiresc.* pp. 414 sqq.

⁷ ἐν τῇ πολυβιβλῳ ἱστορίᾳ, Athen. VI. p. 249 A. But Suidas, who calls it ἱστορία καθολική, states that it contained eighty books, and Josephus quotes 124 books (*Ant. Jud.* XII. 3).

⁸ τοῦ βίου Καίσαρος ἀγωγή, Suidas. There is a fragment of this in Coray's *Ælian*, p. 251; *Excerpt. Peiresc.* p. 473. The existence of a separate life of Herod is merely inferred from the manner in which Josephus speaks of his manner of dealing with the biography of that personage.

⁹ Phot. *Cod.* CLXXXIX.; Stobæus, *Floril.* I. pp. 118, 130, 138, 167, al. Meineke.

¹⁰ Eustath. *ad Dionys. Perieget.* v. 976.

lines.¹ Besides these, he wrote philosophical treatises² and commentaries on the older philosophers.³ From the accounts which we have of Nicolas, and from the fragmentary specimens of his writings, we are led to regret the loss of some of them ; but his history seems to have been a very hasty compilation written to gratify Herod, and ostentatiously diffuse and prolix.

We have already mentioned the history of POSEIDONIUS, who, like Strabo, both continued Polybius and built up a system of geography on the foundations of Eratosthenes.⁴ Besides these labours, Poseidonius, like Theophanes, wrote a book on Pompey the Great, whom he had accompanied on his Asiatic campaigns,⁵ or had, at all events, seen just as he was about to join his army.⁶ As a recent writer has observed,⁷ 'the curious account of the Servile War in Sicily, in the remains of the thirty-fourth book of Diodorus, appears to be borrowed from Poseidonius,' and there can be no doubt that he was constantly in the hands of Strabo, as an authority both for his lost work, and his extant book on geography. So that he may be considered to have done more than any writer to bridge the interval which separates the great Alexandrian authors and Polybius from the historians and geographers whom we are about to discuss.

§ 2. DIODORUS, a native of Agyrium, near Centuripæ, in Sicily, whence he is generally known as 'the Sicilian' (*Siculus*, Σικελιώτης), flourished in the time of the first two Cæsars.⁸ The dates of his birth and death are unknown. He tells us

¹ Stobæus, *Serm.* I. pp. 266, 7, Meineke ; but see Meineke, *Hist. Crit. Com.* pp. 495, 6.

² As *περὶ ψυχῆς*, Stob. *Ecl.* I. 52, p. 842 ; *περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς καλῶν*, Simplicius, *ad Epict.* 37, p. 1947.

³ Especially on Aristotle (Buhle, *ad Aristot. Op.* I. p. 308 ; Röper, *Lectiones Abulpharagianæ*, Danzig, 1844, pp. 35—43.). It has even been supposed that Nicolas was the author of the treatise on plants attributed to Aristotle : above, chapter XL. § 8, p. 307 [147].

⁴ Above, chapter XLVII. § 7.

⁵ *Fragm. Hist. Gr.* III. p. 290.

⁶ Strabo (XI. p. 492), says, that when Pompey was starting from Rhodes, where he had attended the lectures of Poseidonius, he asked the philosopher if he had any further commands, on which he quoted the line of Homer (*Il.* XIV. 208) :

ἀλὲν ἀρριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.

⁷ Sir G. C. Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. p. 31, who refers in note (62) to the use which Plutarch and Appian have made of Poseidonius.

⁸ See Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 211, 213.

that he had devoted thirty years of his life to the composition of his general history, and that he had undertaken laborious and perilous journeys through a great part of Europe and Asia for the purpose of seeing with his own eyes the scenes of the most important events which he describes. He dwells on the advantages which he had derived from a prolonged residence at Rome, and tells us that frequent intercourse with the Romans in his native island had made him familiar with the Latin language and thus enabled him to study with ease and profit the various records which he found in the city.¹ These particulars, which we derive from the introduction to his great work, comprise nearly all that we know about him. It was his object in this book, which is called 'the historical library' (βιβλιοθήκη ιστορικὴ),² to write a general history of the world, from the mythological ages down to the commencement of Cæsar's Gallic wars in B.C. 60. He was strongly impressed with the importance of his subject, and with the imperfections of previous attempts, and spared no pains to realize the ideal which he had formed in his mind. He was writing this book after the death of Julius Cæsar.³ He mentions that he had been in Egypt in Ol. 180, before Ptolemy was recognized by the Romans, *i.e.* before B.C. 59;⁴ therefore his visit must have taken place in B.C. 60. Now this journey was of course one of those undertaken with a view to his work. And as Egypt is the subject of his first book, which lays down the year B.C. 59, when Cæsar went to Gaul as the goal of the undertaking,⁵ it is fair to infer that the thirty years which he spent on the work may be dated from B.C. 60, and that its publication may be referred to B.C. 30. He is set down by Hieronymus as flourishing in B.C. 43. The inference of Scaliger, that Diodorus

¹ Diodor. I. 4 : τριάκοντα μὲν ἔτη περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπραγματεύεσθαι, μετὰ δὲ πολλῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ κινδύνων ἐπήλθομεν πολλὴν τῆς τε Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης . . . διὰ τὴν ἐν Ῥώμῃ χορηγίαν τῶν πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν ἀνηκόντων· ἡ γὰρ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ὑπεροχὴ . . . πλείστας ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς παρέσχετο παρεπιδημήσασιν ἐν αὐτῇ πλείω χρόνον. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐξ Ἀγυρίου τὸ γένος τῆς Σικελίας ὄντες καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπιμίσχιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου περιπεποιημένοι, κ.τ.λ.

² This title is given it by Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* I. 6, p. 18 D. p. 21, Heinichen.

³ *Ibid.* p. 9, Dindorf: Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ ὁ διὰ τὰς πράξεις προσαγορευθεὶς θεός.

⁴ Diod. I. 44, 83.

⁵ I. 4.

wrote after B.C. 9, rests on an interpolated text, and is therefore invalid.¹

The historical library of Diodorus consisted of forty books, divided into three great sections. The first of these sections, containing the mythical period down to the taking of Troy, (which he places with Apollodorus 408 years before the commencement of the Olympiads, *i. e.* in B.C. 1138)² occupies the first six books. The second section, from the seventh to the eighteenth book, contains a chronological history from the taking of Troy to the death of Alexander the Great. The third period, occupying the twenty-three remaining books, carries the history down to the British expedition of Julius Cæsar. Of these forty books, we have only a portion complete, namely books 1—5, containing the history of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Æthiopians, and Greeks; and books 11—20, containing the period from the invasion of Xerxes down to the year B.C. 302. The rest of the work is either lost altogether, or represented only by a series of fragments and extracts, of which the most considerable refer to books 30—40.³ The following is a general analysis of the remains of Diodorus:—Book I. On Egypt; its mythology, geography, and history; its laws, literature, and customs; and the Greeks who have travelled in the country. II. The legendary history of Assyria, from Ninus to Sardanapalus; the Medes, Chaldæans, Indians, Scythians, Hyperboreans, Arabians, with an account of the island of Ceylon. III. On the Æthiopians, and other nations of Libya. IV. The mythology of Greece. V. On the Greek islands, and the Phœnician settlements in the Mediterranean. He also treats of the islands of the Atlantic, and of Arabia and its seas. XI. From the invasion of Xerxes (Ol. 75, 1), down to the war of Cyprus (Ol. 82, 2), with contemporary notices of Sicily, Egypt, and Rome.⁴ XII. From the war of Cyprus (Ol. 82, 3) to that of

¹ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 213.

² Diodor. I. 5; Clinton, *F. H.* I. p. 125.

³ The fragments of Diodorus are due chiefly to Photius, *Cod.* CCXLIV., and to the excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; see Mai, *Collect. Nova Script.* II. pp. 1. sqq. 568 sqq.; L. Dindorf, *Excerpta Vaticana*, Lips. 1828 (in the third vol. of his edition of Diodorus).

⁴ The earliest notice of Roman history in Diodorus, after the time of the kings, is that of the destruction of the Fabian clan at Cremera, XI. 53. Niebuhr says

Syracuse (Ol. 91, 1) with notices of Sybaris, of Charondas, and Zaleucus, and the Decemvirate at Rome. XIII. From the war between Syracuse and Athens (Ol. 91, 2) down to that between Syracuse and the Carthaginians (Ol. 93, 4). XIV. From the time of the thirty tyrants (Ol. 94, 1) to the taking of Rome by the Gauls (Ol. 98, 2).¹ XV. From the war between Artaxerxes and Evagoras (Ol. 98, 3) to the accession of Philip (Ol. 105, 2). XVI. Reign of Philip of Macedon. XVII. Reign of Alexander the Great. XVIII. Successors of Alexander down to the domination of Agathocles in Sicily (Ol. 115, 3). XIX. Events in Greece, Sicily, and Italy, down to the battle of Himera (Ol. 117, 2). XX. From the war of Agathocles in Sicily (Ol. 117, 3) down to the coalition against Antigonus (Ol. 119, 3).

It will be observed that, in the introduction to his work, Diodorus, as he has to deal with mythologies and traditions, which do not admit of a chronological arrangement, groups the subject according to the different nations which he undertakes to discuss; but that in the strictly historical part of the book he adheres rigidly to the order of time. He commemorates the successive events with annalistic precision, distinguishing, however, between the more important, and more peculiarly Greek transactions, which he gives with considerable details, and the foreign and miscellaneous (ἐτερογενεῖς),² or collateral occurrences (συνεχεῖς πράξεις),³ which he mentions very briefly.

(*H. R.* II. note 457), that this disaster and the subsequent defeat of the Consul T. Menenius, are 'mixt up into one great battle by Diodorus, but, no doubt, merely through his own stupidity.'

¹ Sir G. C. Lewis remarks (*Credibility of Early Roman History*, II. p. 347), that the narrative given by Diodorus of the capture of Rome is 'unusually copious in comparison with his other notices of Roman history at this period,' but that his account 'confounds together events which the received narrative places in a wholly different order,' and that 'this confusion and translocation of events renders the entire narrative of Diodorus suspicious.'

² XI. 20: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀρκοῦντως διεληλυθότες περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην πραχθέντων μεταβιβάζομεν τὴν διήγησιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐτερογενεῖς πράξεις. I. 9: ὅπως ἀρξάμενοι τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ιστορουμένων μηδεμίαν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαιολογίαις ἐτερογενῇ πράξιν παρεμβάλομεν.

³ XX. 21 extr.: ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν τῶν γεγονότων διελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰς συνεχεῖς πράξεις μεταβιβάζομεν τὸν λόγον. This use of the word συνεχεῖς is rather peculiar. It generally denotes 'continuous' rather than 'coeval' or 'col-

The chief value and interest of a compilation like that of Diodorus consist in the extent to which it may be regarded as a faithful representative of older books now lost. He does not, however, quote his authorities, and we are left to deduce from conjecture and inference the sources from which he has derived his information. This subject has been fully discussed by Heyne¹ and others. We give here the results of the inquiry.

Although Diodorus visited Egypt, and starts from the antiquities of that remarkable country, he does not seem to have engaged in any independent study of its history. 'He brought to this subject,' says a modern Egyptologist,² 'only extensive reading, without judgment or any spirit of original inquiry, or indeed any observation, and in this way he confused the traditions which he had before him, instead of sifting and elucidating them.' He seems never to have read the works of Manetho and Eratosthenes, though those, whom he took as his guides, had borrowed from one or the other of these authorities.³ It is possible to extract much valuable information from the clumsy patchwork of this Egyptian section in Diodorus; but as a whole it has been a great stumbling-block to writers on the subject. Who was his principal guide cannot be ascertained. He seems to have used Hecataeus of Abdera in his account of Thebes.⁴ In the second book he takes Ctesias rather than Herodotus as his authority for the history of Assyria.⁵ The account of the Hyperboreans is probably due to Hecataeus of Abdera.⁶ Hieronymus of Cardia and Agatharchides have supplied him with materials for his history of Arabia.⁷ And he quotes Iambulus for the wonderful account of Ceylon.⁸ The

lateral.' But the rhetoricians and grammarians employed the word *συνέχεια*, which, in Diodorus, signifies 'perseverance' and 'continuance' (see V. 9, p. 455, Dind., where *συνηθεία* is substituted for the old reading *συνεχέλα*, and p. 456, where we have *τὴν συνέχειαν τῶν γυμνασίων*), to signify *συσυγία* or *σύνθεσις* (Dionys. *Cens. Script.* V. 2).

¹ *De Fontibus et Auctoribus Historiarum Diodori*. Reprinted in Dindorf's edition, V. pp. LIX. sqq.

² Bunsen, *Aegypten*, I p. 177.

³ *Id. ibid.* p. 178.

⁴ I. 46, p. 56, l. 99, Wesseling; whose note on II. p. 544, l. 73, may be consulted as to the counter-claims of the namesakes of Abdera and Miletus. See a special trace of Hecataeus cited by Heyne, u. s. p. LXXXI. Dindorf.

⁵ II. 2, 5, 7, 15, and the other passages quoted by Heyne, p. LXXVII. note 3.

⁶ II. 47.

⁷ Heyne, p. XCI.

⁸ II. 55 *ad fin.*

other details may have been furnished by any of the writers of the same class as Callimachus. The fabulous stories about Libya in the third book are referred to Agatharchides, Artemidorus, and Dionysius of Miletus, and the last of these was the chief authority for the fourth book.¹ In the fifth book he has been guided by Philistus, Timæus, and his own contemporary Poseidonius.² Zeno of Rhodes was his authority for what is said of that island.³ And he quotes himself, as his authors in regard to Cræte, Epimenides, Dosiades, Sosicrates, and Laothēnides.⁴ For the islands on the coast of Arabia he found his information in Euhemerus, whose religious views were analysed at length in the sixth book. In the general history of the eleventh and following books, he had before him the great Greek historians, whom we have discussed in previous chapters. For the history of his native island he made great use of Antiochus, Philistus, Athanis, Philinus, and Timæus.⁵ His Roman history was derived from Fabius Pictor, Polybius, and Poseidonius.⁶ In his chronology, which is one of the best features of his work, Diodorus perhaps took Apollodorus as his chief guide. He had besides the example of Timæus and Philochorus, and was perhaps acquainted with Castor.

The style of Diodorus is free from rhetorical affectation,⁷ and, though sometimes influenced by that of the books from which he was compiling for the time being, it is on the whole conformable to the Attic type, and not deformed by the debased and colloquial phrasology, which was current in his time.⁸ There is, however, no vigour or animation in his narratives. He is content to give a bare recital of the facts, which crowded

¹ Heyne, p. XCIII. sq.; CI. sq.

² *Id.* p. CV.

³ V. 56. Cf. Diog. Laërt. VII. 35.

⁴ V. 80 *ad fin.*

⁵ Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. p. 69: 'the detailed history of Sicilian affairs during the times of the two Dionysii and Agathocles, which is related by Diodorus, may be safely relied on as authentic, because it is founded on the works of Antiochus.'

⁶ Heyne, p. CXVIII. sq.

⁷ Niebuhr supposes (III. note 848), from the gnomes extracted from book XXI., that Diodorus introduced some speeches into his history of Pyrrhus.

⁸ Photius (*Cod.* LXX.), defines his style thus: *κέχρηται δὲ φράσει σαφεῖ καὶ ἀκόμψῃ καὶ ἱστορίᾳ μάλιστα προποῦσῃ καὶ μήτε τὰς λίαν ὑπερητυκισμένας ἢ ἀρχαιοτρόπους διώκων συντάξεις μήτε πρὸς τὴν καθωμιλημένην νεύων παντελῶς ἀλλὰ τῷ μέσῳ τῶν λόγων χαρακτῆρι χαίρων.*

upon him and left him no time to be diffuse or ornamental. If he was the author of the rhetorical fragment attributed to him, his abstinence from all displays of oratory must have been the result of the principles by which he was guided in his compilation, rather than of his dislike for such exercitations. The Latin letters which bear his name are undoubtedly a modern forgery.¹

§ 3. DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus, besides the rhetorical treatises which have been already examined, wrote a great historical work called *Roman Archæology* (Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία), or 'historical discourses' (ιστορικοὶ λόγοι), in twenty books, and a treatise of chronology (χρόνοι² or χρονικά³), of the extent and object of which we know nothing. The *Roman Archæology*, which was published in A.U.C. 747, B.C. 7,⁴ two years after that at which Livy's history terminated,⁵ was intended to take the place of all other works⁶ as an introduction to Polybius, and was carried down from the earliest time to B.C. 264, when Polybius really begins.⁷ As that great writer had endeavoured to reconcile his countrymen to the supremacy of Rome, which was established in Greece during his own lifetime, by showing how divine Providence, using the institutions of Rome and the genius and courage of great Romans as its chosen instruments, had naturally and inevitably brought about this state of things, Dionysius thought that he might both gratify his countrymen and flatter the Romans by carrying the same view of the matter a little farther. Not only does he show, like Polybius, that the supremacy of Rome was due rather to the virtues and abilities of the great Romans than to the mere fortune of the city, but he enters upon an elaborate

¹ They appeared first in Italian (Carrera, *Storia di Catana*, 1639) and afterwards in a Latin version by Preiger, which is reprinted in Wesseling's Diodorus. The supposed Greek original has never been forthcoming.

² Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 320.

³ Suidas.

⁴ Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 253.

⁵ *Id.* p. 251.

⁶ Dionys. I. 5, p. 16, Reiske: οὐδεμία γὰρ ἀκριβὴς ἐξελήλυθε περὶ αὐτῶν Ἑλληνισ ἱστορία μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ὅτι μὴ κεφαλαιώδεις ἐπιτομαὶ πάνυ βραχεῖαι. 8, p. 22: ἀρχομαι οὖν τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιότατων μύθων, οὓς παρέλιπον οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γενόμενοι συγγραφεῖς, καταβιβάζω δὲ τὴν διήγησιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ πρώτου Φοινικικοῦ πολέμου.

⁷ Phot. *Cod.* LXXXIII.: ἀφ' ἧς καὶ φησιν ἀπάρεσθαι τὸν Μεγαλοπολίτην Πολύβιον τῆς ἱστορίας.

demonstration of a theory which he thought likely to salve the wounded pride of the Greeks.¹ His object was to show that the Romans were, after all, not barbarians, as was generally supposed, not the obscure population of an infamous asylum, but a pure Greek race, whose institutions, religion, and manners were traceable to an identity with those of the noblest Hellenes.² In order to establish this hypothesis he collected with much industry all the traditions he could respecting the old races of Italy, especially those which spoke of emigration from Greece. With the same view he interpreted and modified the old legendary history, suppressing whatever was unfavourable to his hypothesis. Even the elaborate rhetorical effusions which he puts into the mouth of his historical characters, are framed so as to countenance the same view. The extreme prolixity of his narrative,³ which occupies eleven books with the subjects so fully discussed in the first three of Livy,⁴ shows the intention of the writer. And there is no doubt that this part of the work, which alone has come down to us nearly complete, was read by his contemporary Greeks with pleasure at least, if not with conviction.

But although the historical value of the *Archæology* is seriously impaired by the deliberate intention with which it was written, the work, even in the first half, which has come down to us, is a valuable storehouse for the critical inquirer into the origin of the power of Rome. There can be no doubt that he sought out original authorities with great diligence, and

¹ See the excellent remarks of Sir G. C. Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. pp. 245, 6.

² Dionys. *Antiqu.* I. 3—5, 8, especially pp. 14, 15, Reiske: ἐν ταύτῃ δηλώσω τῇ γραφῇ δι' ἧς "Ελληνάς τε αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἐπίδειξεν ὑπισχνούμαι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἢ φανυλοτάτων ἔθνων συνεληλυθότας. In the fifth book (c. 75, p. 1027, Reiske), he is almost enthusiastic on the grandeur of the Romans: οὐ γὰρ ἀζήλου καὶ ταπεινῆς πόλεως πολιτεύματα καὶ βλοῦς οὐδ' ἀνωνύμων καὶ ἀπερβύμμένων ἀνθρώπων βουλευματα καὶ πράξεις μέλλω διηγείσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπασι τὰ δίκαια καὶ καλὰ ὀριζούσης πόλεως καὶ περὶ τῶν εἰς τοῦτο καταστησαμένων αὐτὴν τῷ ἀξιώματι ἡγεμόνων ἀποδεικθήσεται.

³ It is stated that he published an abridgment of his work in five books, Phot. *Cod.* LXXXIV.

⁴ Lewis, u. s.: 'Livy compresses into one book, out of 142, his history of the Foundation of Rome and of the seven kings; whereas Dionysius allots four books out of twenty—a fifth part of his work—to the same period.'

collected ancient traditions with no ordinary care.¹ Although it contradicts the legend about Sextus Tarquinius, which, like Livy, he introduces into his narrative, he lets us know that he was acquainted with the treaty between Tarquinius Superbus and the people of Gabii.² He also cites the league of the Latins with Servius Tullius,³ though it is inconsistent with the account which he gives in the text of his work;⁴ and he is the only writer who supplies us with the valuable information that the Latins by virtue of that league enjoyed the rights of isopolity. Although he wishes to Grecize Italy as far as he can, it is to him alone that we owe the preservation of the original name of the Etruscans, and so are enabled to start in our inquiries respecting the ethnography of the most un-Greek tribe in the Peninsula.⁵ He did not always understand the constitutional terms which he found in his documents, for example, he regarded the curies as democratic,⁶ and confused the *populus* of ancient Rome with the δῆμος of Thucydides and Aristophanes.⁷ But in these matters he sometimes corrected his erroneous impressions and stated the truth which he learned from further inquiry.⁸ And even Niebuhr, who has done more than any one to destroy the fabric which he has built up, has admitted 'the exemplary precision'⁹ with which Dionysius expresses himself when anything depends on the exactness of his words, and has declared that the more he searched the greater were the treasures which he found in Dionysius.¹⁰

The *Archæology* was probably divided into two volumes, each containing a decad of books.¹¹ The first of these is

¹ See Dionys. *Antiqu.* I. 73 ; XI. 62, and compare his criticisms on the Greek historians, *De Thucyd. Judicium*, 5, 7.

² IV. 58.

³ IV. 26 : αὐτῇ διέμεινεν ἡ στήλη μέχρι τῆς ἐμῆς ἡλικίας ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ κειμένη (i.e. in the temple of Diana on the Aventine).

⁴ Niebuhr supposes (*H. R.* II. 50), that he did not find and insert his extract from the original document, till after he had written the passages which contradict it—nay, till after he had published his work.

⁵ See Donaldson, *Varronianus*, pp. 16, 69.

⁶ Niebuhr, II. 180, 220, 222.

⁷ *Id. ibid.* notes 417, 425, and *Lectures*, I. p. 52 : 'He did not comprehend the happy distinction of Fabius between δῆμος (*populus*) and δμιλος (*plebs*), and he called the former πλῆθος and the latter δῆμος.'

⁸ Niebuhr, *H. R.* II. p. 222.

⁹ *H. R.* III. p. 259.

¹⁰ *Lectures*, I. p. 53.

¹¹ Niebuhr, *Lectures*, I. p. 48.

complete and is contained in a very considerable number of manuscripts. The second decad, as a whole, is lost. We have only a portion of the eleventh book, and a number of extracts from the other books, some of them very carelessly put together, and, it seems, often tampered with by the collector.¹ It is also considered that we have substantially some remains of the second decad of Dionysius in Plutarch's life of Camillus and in Appian's first three books, which were entirely compiled from the *Archæology*.²

The contents of the first decad are as follows: In the *first* book the author gives the period anterior to the foundation of Rome. The *second* book contains the reigns of Romulus and Numa. The *third* treats of Tullus Hostilius, Ancus, and Tarquin the elder. The *fourth* discusses the last two kings. In the *fifth* the history of the republic is carried down to the institution of the dictatorship. The *sixth* terminates with the exploits of Coriolanus and the treaty with the Latins. The *seventh* book extends from the consulship of T. Geganius and P. Minucius to that of Sulpicius Camerinus and Sp. Largus, and ends with an elaborate account of the resemblance between the Greek and Roman games, with a view to the establishment of the author's hypothesis that the Romans were not barbarians. The *eighth* book begins with the banishment of Coriolanus and goes down to the consulship of Q. Fabius and C. Julius. The *ninth* book terminates with the triumphs of Lucretius over the Æqui and of Veturius over the Volsci. The *tenth* book carries us down to the re-election of the decemvirate and their combination against the liberties of the republic.

Of the second decad, as we have already mentioned, we have only the beginning. The downfall of the decemvirs is told at length in the *eleventh* book, which, as we have said, is mutilated. The *thirteenth* book contained the history of the capture of Rome by the Gauls. In the *fifteenth* book the first Samnite war was described. The *seventeenth*, *eighteenth*, and *nineteenth* books contained the war with Pyrrhus; and the *twentieth* carried down the history to the beginning of the first

¹ Niebuhr, *H. R.* III. note 934.

² *Id. ibid.* II. note 916.

Punic war. Omitting, then, the first book, which contains the general introduction, Dionysius includes 364 years in books 2—13, which gives an average of thirty years for each book; but 126 years in the remaining seven books, or eighteen years on the average in each book;¹ and this is not a greater difference than the comparative distinctness and certainty of the later history would seem to require.

The style of Dionysius is not unworthy of a man who has so minutely criticised other historians. Much as he censures Polybius, he has not hesitated to imitate in many respects the diction of the work, to which he intended his own as an introduction. In fact, Polybius and Thucydides are his chief models, so far as he has adhered to the older historical phraseology.² But there is much more of the practised rhetorician in Dionysius, and he has committed a far greater fault in endeavouring to treat pragmatically the early history of Rome, which does not admit of such a treatment, than in dramatizing incidents, and putting into the mouths of half-civilized Romans the ingenious declamations of an Asiatic Sophist.

§ 4. What Dionysius endeavoured to do for the gratification of his own countrymen by giving them a Greek version of Roman history, an accomplished Jew, who lived about a century later, attempted, from the opposite point of view, for his own fallen race, in a work which was a direct imitation of that which we have just described. The title 'Archæology,' which had not been used before Dionysius, was adopted by FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, who wrote the same number of books under the title of *Jewish Archæology* ('Ιουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία), in order to show to the Roman conquerors of Jerusalem, and to all readers of Greek, that the Jews did not deserve the contempt with which they were universally regarded.

Josephus, the son of Matthæus, was a member of a priestly family in Judæa, and descended, on the mother's side, from the Asmouæan princes.³ Born at Jerusalem A.D. 37, he received a

¹ Lewis, *Credibility of Early Roman History*, I. p. 73, note (6).

² Photius says (*Cod.* LXXXIII): ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν καὶ τὴν λέξιν καινοπρεπὴς καὶ ἐς τὸ ἀνακεχωρικὸς τῶν πολλῶν τὸν λόγον ἐκβιαζόμενος.

³ *Vit.* I. Phot. *Cod.* LXXVI. Euseb. *H. E.* III. 8.

learned education, and joined the sect of the Pharisees.¹ In A.D. 63 he made a journey to Rome, and gained the favour of Nero's wife, Poppæa.² On his return to his native country, he endeavoured, as he is careful to tell us,³ to dissuade his countrymen from going to war with Rome;⁴ but being unable to control them, he accepted the military command in Galilee, and was taken prisoner at the capture of Jotapata.⁵ Having recommended himself to Vespasian by a dexterous or lucky prediction of that general's elevation to the Imperial throne,⁶ he obtained his freedom⁷ as a client of the Flavian house,⁸ and, of course, took the name of his patron. He accompanied Titus to the siege of Jerusalem, and, after the termination of the war, retired to Rome, where he spent the rest of his life. When he died is not known, but he lived at least to A.D. 97.⁹

His first work was *A History of the Jewish War* (περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου, Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἱστορία περὶ ἀλώσεως) in seven books. It was originally written in his native Aramaic language for circulation in the East, and to justify his military character in the eyes of his countrymen and neighbours; but it was translated by the author into Greek,¹⁰ and published at Rome under the auspices of Titus in A.D. 75.¹¹ Here it was most favourably received, obtained a place in the public library, and gained for its author the honour of a statue.¹² It is, in every sense, an able and valuable work.¹³ The period

¹ *Vit.* 2; *Antiqu.* XIII. 5, § 9, XVIII. 2; *Bell. Jud.* II. 8. He compares the Pharisees with the Stoics, and if this comparison is well founded, it constitutes another resemblance between Josephus and Polybius.

² *Vit.* 3.

³ *Ibid.* 65.

⁴ *Vit.* 4—7; *Bell. Jud.* II. 20, § 4.

⁵ *Vit.* 74, 75; *Bell. Jud.* III. 4, sqq.

⁶ Sueton. *Vesp.* 5: 'et unus ex nobilibus captivis Josephus, quum conjiceretur in vincula, constantissime asseveravit fore ut ab eodem brevi solveretur, verum jam Imperatore.' Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* III. 14, p. 854; Suidas, s.v. Ἰώσηπος.

⁷ *Bell. Jud.* IV. 10, § 7.

⁸ *Vit.* 75, 76; Phot. *Cod.* LXXVI: ὥστε τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τυχεῖν πολιτείας. He was kindly treated not only by Vespasian and Titus, but also by Domitian and his wife.

⁹ He survived Agrippa II., who died in that year (*Vit.* 65).

¹⁰ *Contr. Apion.* I. 9, p. 181, Bekker: χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς.

¹¹ *Procem. ad Bell. Jud.* § 1.

¹² *Vit.* 65.

¹³ He mentions in his first book against Apion, I. 9 some of the grounds for confidence in his care and in his sources of information.

included extends from the taking of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170, to the destruction of the city by Titus.¹

The *History of the Jewish Wars* was followed by the great work in imitation of Dionysius, to which we have already referred, and which from its object must have appeared in Greek only. The *Jewish Archæology* appeared, with a dedication to Epaphroditus, about A.D. 93.² The twenty books extend from the beginning of the world to the year A.D. 66, when the Jewish war broke out. It therefore traverses some of the ground surveyed in the first two books of the former work. In its outward form a professed imitation of the *Archæology* of Dionysius, the work of Josephus is written in the same spirit as that of Polybius, with whom Josephus has many points of analogy.³ Both of them had taken a prominent part in the transactions which marked the last independent efforts of their countrymen. Both of them had been at Rome and formed Roman connexions immediately before the last struggles of Greece or Judæa. Both of them had arrived betimes at a conviction of the irresistible power of Rome, and had endeavoured to impress the same belief on the patriots of their respective countries. But the Greek was not obliged to recommend the literature or history of his own people to the respect of the victors. He was rather induced to address the Greeks with a plea for contented acquiescence in the results of Providence acting by human means; and Dionysius followed him with an elaborate hypothesis, which claimed for Greece the affinity and distinguishing attributes of victorious Rome. The Jew, on the other hand, was compelled to plead with both Rome and Greece for the claims of his country's history and literature to a little more of their respect, or rather to deprecate the neglect and contempt with which they were treated.

¹ The abridged Latin excerpt appended to Ambrose's works with the title *Egisippi* (*ex Josephi?*) *de excidio urbis Hierosolymæ*, seems to be derived from Josephus (Fontanini, *Hist. Lit. Aquilej.* pp. 372 sqq.; Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* VII., p. XXVIII. sqq.). But there was a writer called Hegesippus who described the last days of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E.* II. 23).

² In the twelfth year of Domitian, as he tells us lib. XX. *ad fin.* *Vit. ad fin.*

³ It will be observed that Josephus, as well as Polybius, lays much stress on the special dispensations of Providence (*Bell. Jud.* III. 8, §§ 3, 7; *Vit.* 15, 42).

In doing this, however, he does not take the high ground of a theocratic Jew of the olden time. Having lost his own faith in the divine election and distinctive privileges of the Israelites, he was not likely to astonish his Gentile readers by ventilating pretensions which they would have scouted as preposterous.¹ He had not only abandoned any such extravagant veneration for the religion or religious books of the Jews as might have prompted him to maintain their incomparable sanctity,² but he had even lost his own self-respect. He was a servile flatterer of his patrons, the Flavian family, and even of Agrippa II. In a word, he was not only a Pharisee but an Herodian, and not only an Herodian, but as much an adherent of Rome as any of the publicans in the days of Herod the Great. Accordingly, we do not find him upholding either the miraculous narratives of the Old Testament,³ or the necessary connexion of the Jewish system with a divine revelation. And he utterly renounces the principles of persecuting proselytism which distinguished the Pharisees in the age immediately before his own. For these and other reasons the *Archæology* might be studied with great profit by many persons in modern times, who maintain the superstitious so unequivocally renounced by Josephus, if it were only for the fact that he exhibits familiar objects from a different point of view. But, it must be remembered, that this writer was thoroughly Romanized, and that we are not to expect from him either the unselfish independence of a patriot,

¹ See the way in which he speaks of Moses (*Proem. ad Antiqu.* § 4; *in Apion.* II. 15), and of Abraham's views in travelling to Egypt (*Antiqu.* I. 8, § 1).

² He uses the ordinary phrases concerning the literature of his country (e.g. τὰ δικάως θεία πιστευμένα, *apud Euseb. H. E.* III. 10, p. 214, Heinichen), but it is clear from his general mode of dealing with these books that he did not regard them as infallible, and it may be inferred from at least one passage that he recognized the existence at some former time of older documents from which the canonical books were derived (see *Antiqu.* V. 17, § 1, p. 250, l. 30, Bekker).

³ He not only throws doubt (*Antiqu.* IX. 10, § 2) on the historical truth of the story about Jobah and the whale, which few critics are able to defend (see Rosenmüller, VII. 2, pp. 338 sqq.), but he resolves apparently into natural occurrences the two great and cardinal deliverances of the Jewish people—that at the passage of the Red Sea, and that in the conflict with Sisera. Of the former he says doubtingly, εἴτε κατὰ βούλησιν θεοῦ εἴτε κατ' αὐτόματον, and compares a similar event in the history of Alexander the Great (*Antiqu.* II. 16, § 5), and the stars which fought against Sisera are described as a violent storm which beat against the faces of the Canaanites and overflowed the river Kishon (*Antiqu.* V. 5, § 4).

nor the enthusiastic faith of a sincere believer.¹ The interest which theologians have always felt in the parallelisms between Josephus and the Old Testament, and his contributions to the history of the connexion between the Old Testament and the New, have not unnaturally led to the wish that he had taken some notice of the rise of Christianity; and that this wish might not remain ungratified, some Christian, either Eusebius himself or one living about his time, has interpolated the eighteenth book with an account of Jesus Christ, almost recognizing his divinity, and plainly asserting his Messiahship.² Nothing but a wish to maintain such a testimony to Christianity could have blinded any modern critic to the obvious fact that this passage is a forgery. If it had been possible that Josephus should have written such a testimony, we may be sure that he would have said a great deal more on the subject, especially when he had such a good opportunity of speaking about the Christian religion in his twentieth book, where he mentions with disapprobation the murder of St. James, the near relation and representative of its Founder.³ Nor would the citation of such a passage have been left to Eusebius alone, if it had existed in the text before his time. Justin Martyr and Origen would have quoted it with exultation. We have no hesitation in declaring

¹ Mr. De Quincey has expressed his conviction that Josephus was the worst of traitors in the strongest language which he could use (*Selections*, vol. VII. *Preface*, p. X.); he does not, we fear, make sufficient allowance for the circumstances of the case.

² The celebrated passage is as follows (Euseb. *H. E.* I. 11): γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς τις σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἀνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν σὺν ἡδονῇ τάληθῇ δεχομένων. Καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμῆκός τις Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐξεπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων. Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τούτου ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.

³ *Antiqu.* XX. 9, § 1. The citation from Josephus by Origen (*ad Matth.* p. 223; in *Cels.* I. p. 35) and Eusebius (*H. E.* II. 23) to the effect that the destruction of Jerusalem was a punishment inflicted on the Jews for the murder of James does not occur in any MSS. of our author, and was probably a forgery suggested by the Christian belief that James and some other Apostle, probably Matthias (*Chr. Orthod.* p. 275), were the two witnesses mentioned in the *Apocalypse*, XI. 3—8. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* II. 23, p. 172, Heinichen.

it a transparent fabrication of the age of Eusebius, and are inclined to agree with those who think that Eusebius, being quite capable of such a fraud, was himself the fabricator of this interpolation.¹

The supplement to the *Archæology*, in two books, which is generally known as the treatise 'Against Apion' (περὶ ἀρχαιότητος Ἰουδαίων κατὰ Ἀπίωνος), is a learned defence of the antiquity of the Jewish nation against those who impugned it for the want of Greek testimonies. Apion, in particular, an Alexandrian grammarian somewhat before the time of Josephus, had written a book against the Jews, and he is answered in the first part of the second book. This book, like the *Archæology*, abounds in Greek and Rabbinistic learning,² and we are indebted to it for much information, which is not preserved in any other form. For example, the extracts from Manetho,³ and the accounts of the flight from Egypt, which are cited from Chæremon and Lysimachus,⁴ are not found elsewhere. It is dedicated, like the *Archæology*, to Epaphroditus, to whom the author has also inscribed another supplement to his great work—namely, his own life in one book.

The following works attributed to Josephus are not genuine: (a) 'the fourth book of the Maccabees' (εἰς Μακκαβαίους ἡ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), sometimes appended to our Apocrypha;⁵ (b) 'on the universe' (περὶ τοῦ παντος), preserved by Johannes Philoponus, and more generally assigned to Hippolytus or the presbyter Caius.⁶

He announces his intention, at the end of his *Archæology*, to write a treatise, in three books, on the Theosophy of the Jews and on the Mosaic system: but we have no trace of it. Jerome⁷ mentions a work by Josephus on the seventy weeks of Daniel, which has also disappeared.

¹ See Heinichen, *Excursus I. ad Euseb. I. 11*, vol. III. pp. 332—355, who has appealed to the fact that 'Eusebius in *H. E.* II. 10, certe satis similem fraudem vere commisit.'

² See, for example, in *Apion. I. 7*, compared with *1 Chron. VI. 1—15*.

³ In *Apionem, I. 14—16*, 26 sq. Cf. Euseb. *Præp. Evang. X. 13*; *Armen. Chron. I. 21*.

⁴ In *Apionem, I. 32, 34*.

⁶ See Photius, *Cod. XLVIII*.

⁵ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr. V. p. 7*.

⁷ *Præf. ad libr. XI. Comment. in Esaiam*.


§ 5. The Augustan age produced not only the introduction to Polybius by Dionysius, but also a continuation of his work by Strabo, who is known to us as the author of the most elaborate and accurate Greek treatise on geography that has descended to our times.

STRABO¹ was a native of Amasea, or Amasia, in the kingdom of Pontus, and was born B.C. 66.² His family was one of great opulence and importance.³ On the mother's side he was descended from Dorylaus, 'the tactician' (ὁ τακτικός), the friend and general of Mithridates Euergetes. His great-uncle on this side, the grandson of Dorylaus, was Moaphernes, the governor of Colchis under Mithridates. His mother's name is not known. Of his father's family, we hear that his grandfather joined Lucullus, and we may suppose that his father attached himself to Pompey. For the name *Strabo* was the cognomen of Pompey,⁴ and was no doubt borne by him, as it was by his father, until it was superseded by the title *Magnus*.

¹ For our account of the life and works of Strabo we have had an excellent guide in C. G. Groskurd's introduction to his careful and scholarlike German translation (*Strabon's Erdbeschreibung*, Berlin und Stettin, 1831).

² This is Groskurd's inference (p. XII.), from the assumption that Strabo must have been thirty when he saw Corinth in B.C. 36, and Coray comes to the same conclusion. His having seen Servilius Isauricus (XIII. p. 568), is a proof that he must have been born at least as early as B.C. 54 (see Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 277), and as he had heard Tyrannio who died, at the latest, in A.D. 46 (Clinton, p. 185), he must have been born about twenty years before that event.

³ The following table is given by Clinton (III. p. 553), on the authority of Strabo, pp. 477, 478, 557.



⁴ Plin. *H. N.* VII. § 54.

As this latter title was adopted by Pompey long before the birth of the geographer,¹ it is probable that the former cognomen was assumed by Strabo's father, and so passed down to him. The opulence of the family to which Strabo belonged is shown by the facts that he enjoyed the best education which could be obtained at the time, and that he spent a long life in travelling and in literary leisure, without belonging to any profession. He calls himself a pupil of the grammarian Tyrannio, under whom he must have studied at Rome,² and therefore, perhaps, at a more advanced age; when quite young, however, he was sent to the celebrated school of Aristodemus at Nysa in Caria.³ Having under these masters made himself perfect in grammar and rhetoric, he commenced philosophy under the Aristotelian teacher Xenarchus, of Seleucia in Cilicia,⁴ where he had the future Stoic Boethus as his fellow-pupil;⁵ and he became ultimately an adherent of the Stoic school, to which he was introduced by Athenodorus of Tarsus.⁶ The acquaintance which he gained with mathematics and astronomy seems to be due to his prolonged stay at Alexandria,⁷ and it is clear that the great Eratosthenes was one of his favourite authors. Plutarch calls him 'Strabo the philosopher',⁸ and it may be inferred that he commenced his literary life as a teacher of Stoic doctrines.⁹ His first great labour was a continuation of the history of Polybius, who also belonged to this school. Either in imitation of that writer, or because he contemplated a work on geography, as an extension of Eratosthenes, he

¹ It seems most probable that Pompey was greeted *Magnus* at his triumph in B.C. 81 (*vide* Drumann, *Gesch. Rom.* IV. p. 335.)

² XII. p. 548: *Τυραννίων οὗ ἡμεῖς ἠκροάσαμεν*. Groskurd says, 'welcher zu Amisus in Pontus lehrte' (p. XVIII.). But Tyrannio was taken to Rome B.C. 71 (Plut. *Lucull.* 19, Suidas, s. v.), and Strabo speaks of him as established there (XIII. p. 609).

³ XIV. p. 650: *οὗ διηκούσαμεν ἐσχατογῆρῳ νέοι παντελῶς ἐν τῇ Νύσῃ*.

⁴ XIV. p. 670. He was not much at Seleucia, but generally lived at Alexandria or Athens, and ultimately at Rome, where, or at Alexandria, Strabo may have heard him.

⁵ XVI. p. 757: *ὧ συνεφιλοσοφῆσαμεν ἡμεῖς τὰ Ἀριστοτέλεια*.

⁶ XVII. p. 779.

⁷ II. p. 101: *ἐγνώμεν ἡμεῖς ἐπιδημοῦντες τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ πολὺν χρόνον*. Cf. I. 58.

⁸ *Cæsar.* 63: *Στράβων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἱστορεῖ*.

⁹ See, as indications of his Stoicism, XVII. p. 810, IX. p. 415, and his remarks on Aristotle, p. 104.

undertook a series of journeys. With Greece itself he did not make himself familiar as a tourist. Perhaps he thought that in this well-known and well-traversed region he might trust to the descriptions of others. Corinth, Athens, Argos, and Megara, and their immediate vicinity, were the only parts of Greece which he had seen with his own eyes. As the general limits of his travels, he states¹ that Armenia to the east, the coast of Etruria over against Sardinia to the west, the Euxine to the north, and Æthiopia to the south, were the most distant points that he reached. But he says that between these limits few had visited more places than he had,² and he mentions in the course of his work a very considerable number of countries and cities, which he had surveyed himself. He was most familiar, no doubt, with his native land and the adjoining regions in Asia Minor; and the dominions of Mithridates, in general, seem to have been well known to him. The description, for instance, which he gives of the Crimea, especially of the harbours of Sebastopol and Balaclava, is so exactly true³ that he would seem to have resided on the spot. It is inferred that Strabo died about A.D. 24,⁴ for he speaks of Cyzicus as still a free state,⁵ and it lost this privilege in A.D. 25.⁶ In his last book he refers to the death of Juba as having occurred recently;⁷ but we do not otherwise know the date of that event.⁸ It is clear, however, that he wrote a passage in the fourth book in the year A.D. 18,⁹ and that the conclusion of the sixth book was after the death of Augustus in A.D. 14, and before the death of Germanicus in A.D. 19.¹⁰ The twelfth book was completed after the death of Archelaus¹¹ in A.D. 17,¹² and a few years must be allowed for the final revision of the

¹ II. p. 117.

² *Ibid.* οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ οὐδὲ εἰς ἂν εὐρεθείη τῶν γεωγραφησάντων πολὺ τι ἥμῶν μᾶλλον ἐπεληλυθὼς τῶν λεχθέντων διαστημάτων.

³ VII. pp. 308, 309, 312. The names which he gives to the harbours of Sebastopol and Balaclava respectively are very expressive. The former is called Κτενοῦς, 'the comb-harbour,' on account of its numerous indentations; and the latter Συμβόλων (leg. Συμβολῶν) Λιμὴν, 'the harbour which is nearly closed at the mouth,' being, as he calls it, λιμὴν στενόστομος.

⁴ Groskurd, p. XVI.

⁵ XII. p. 576.

⁶ Tac. *Ann.* IV. 36.

⁷ XVII. pp. 828, 829.

⁸ Above, § 1.

⁹ p. 206.

¹⁰ p. 288.

¹¹ p. 534.

¹² Clinton, *F. H.* III. p. 437.

whole work. On the supposition that the work, as we have it, was published as it is by Strabo, all this would show that the author died between A.D. 21 and 25; and if the inference respecting his birth-year is correct, this computation allows him a life of ninety years.

The continuation of Polybius, to which we have referred, was entitled 'Historical Commentaries' (ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα).¹ It contained forty-three books,² and extended from the downfall of Greece, with which Polybius concluded, to the death of Julius Cæsar, or perhaps to the battle of Actium.³ In this book he intended to rival and supersede the similar work of his brother Stoic Poseidonius. The statement of Athenæus, on the authority of Strabo himself, that he had known Poseidonius,⁴ can only refer to the geographer's frequent mention of him in his book. Strabo was a mere boy when Poseidonius died;⁵ but, as a friend of Pompey, that philosopher may have been in familiar intercourse with Strabo's father, if he also was a client of Pompey. Strabo expressly states that his object in this work was the same as that which he avows in his geography, namely, to write a book adapted for the educated classes, and useful for moral and political philosophy.⁶ That it was eminently systematic and formal may be inferred from the fact that it had a general introduction in four books before the continuation of Polybius properly commenced. This fact appears in his reference⁷ to 'the sixth book of his historical commentaries, but the second

¹ Plut. *Lucullus*, 28.

² Strabo cites the sixth book, XI. p. 515. Suid. s. v. Πολύβιος: ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ Στράβων Ἀμασεὺς τὰ μετὰ Πολύβιον ἐν βιβλίοις μγ'.

³ Groskurd, I. p. 21, note 2.

⁴ XIV. p. 657.

⁵ Clinton (*F. H.* III. p. 553) understands the phrase κατ' ἡμᾶς in Strabo, XVI. p. 753, 'in its plain meaning, that Poseidonius was yet alive after the birth of Strabo.'

⁶ I. p. 13, B: ἀπλῶς δὲ κοινὸν εἶναι τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦτο δεῖ καὶ πολιτικὸν καὶ δημοφελὲς ὁμοίως ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν τῆς ἱστορίας γραφὴν. ἀκατέκλει δὲ πολιτικὸν λέγομεν οὐχὶ τὸν παντάπασιν ἀπαίδευτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν μετασχόντα τῆς τε ἐγκυκλίου καὶ συνήθους ἀγωγῆς τοῖς ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν—διόπερ ἡμεῖς πεποιηκότες ὑπομνήματα ἱστορικὰ χρήσιμα, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνομεν, εἰς τὴν ἠθικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν, ἐγνωμεν προσθεῖναι καὶ τήνδε τὴν σύνταξιν.

⁷ XI. p. 515, C: εἰρηκότες δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν Παρθικῶν νομίμων ἐν τῇ ἔκτῃ τῶν ἱστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων βίβλῳ, δευτέρα δὲ τῶν μετὰ Πολύβιον, παραλείψομεν ἐνταῦθα μὴ ταυτολογεῖν δόξομεν.

of his continuation of Polybius :’ for he cannot have written two separate books ‘on the laws and institutions of the Parthians ;’ and his geography contains a general introduction of two books, which, in proportion to the size of the work, is quite as long a preface as the four books prefixed to the forty-three of the history.

The *Geography* (Γεωγραφικά) of Strabo, which has made his name as familiar to modern scholars as that of any Greek writer, though the work was very little quoted or even known in the ages immediately succeeding that in which it appeared,¹ has fortunately come down to us very nearly complete. Based upon the treatise of Eratosthenes, and taking constant notice of the writings of Poseidonius and all the principal contributions to geography before its publication, the work of Strabo is an adequate representative of historical geography as it was in the age of Tiberius, and is much more readable and interesting in every way than the subsequent books of Pliny and Ptolemy. Its merits are literary rather than scientific.² Strabo had acquired at Alexandria some knowledge of mathematics and astronomy ; but these were not his favourite studies, and he underrates the importance of physical geography for which the great Alexandrians had done so much. And although, as we have seen, he had been a great traveller, his strength does not consist in the description of places generally unknown to the public. His object was to give an instructive and readable account of the known world, considered from the point of view taken up by a Greek man of letters. Geography is interesting to him from its connexion with history and literature ; places deserve detailed description because they are mentioned in poems, or have been rendered illustrious by the great men, whom they have produced, or the great events of which they have been the scene. To Strabo the world is nothing except as the

¹ See Humboldt, *Cosmos*, II. p. 558, Otte's Tr.

² Delambre remarks (*Hist. de l'Ast. Anc.* I. p. 254) : ‘il paraît qu'il était peu versé dans les mathématiques et dans l'astronomie, dont il n'avait que les notions indispensables à un géographe. En fait de doctrine, on ne trouve guère dans son livre que ce qu'il avait tiré d'ouvrages plus anciens : mais nous pouvons le consulter comme historien.’

dwelling-place of the human family. With the old poet he would say :

Tall ships and lofty towers are nothing worth
When crews and garrisons have sallied forth.¹

It is on this account that he attaches so much importance to the geographical notices in Homer.² The great epic poet had not relinquished his hold on the educational training of the Greeks. He was still revered as the echo of all the earliest knowledge of his race, and historical geography, in Strabo's sense, would have been very imperfect, if it had not busied itself with the earliest notices of the cities and manners of men. Although the literary purpose of Strabo is so obvious, and though he for the most part confines himself to Greek literature, neglecting and perhaps despising the Roman authorities,³ it is remarkable that he criticises very unfairly some of the best of the Greek writers on his own subject. He reckons Herodotus as a manufacturer of fables, places him on the same footing as Ctesias and Hellanicus,⁴ and makes very little use of him ; though modern researches have tended to establish his credit as an observer of facts, and as a faithful chronicler of all the information which he received and understood. As for Pytheas of Marseilles he rejects him altogether as a downright liar, the falsest of men.⁵ We cannot help thinking that these strong judgments were the results of some general prejudice, which it was left to modern criticism to dissipate. From the days of Strabo to those of Juvenal and Plutarch we have many examples of the slight estimation in which Herodotus was held

¹ Soph. *Ced. R.* 56, 57 :

ὥς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς
ἐρημος ἀνδρῶν μὴ ξυνοικούντων ἔσω.

² He says distinctly, at the beginning of his work (p. 2), that in common with his predecessors, including Hipparchus, he regarded Homer as the ἀρχηγέτης τῆς γεωγραφικῆς ἐμπειρίας.

³ See Groskurd, p. XXXV.

⁴ pp. 43, 507, 8. In the latter passage he says : ῥάδιον δ' ἂν τις Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ Ὀμήρῳ πιστεύσειεν ἡρωολογοῦσι καὶ τοῖς τραγικοῖς ποιηταῖς ἢ Κτησίᾳ τε καὶ Ἡροδότῳ καὶ Ἑλλανίκῳ καὶ ἄλλοις τοιοῦτοις.

⁵ p. 63 : Πυθέας ἀνὴρ ψευδέστατος ἐξήτασται. p. 102 : οὐ πολὺ ἀπολείπεται ταῦτα τῶν Πυθέου καὶ Εὐήμερου καὶ Ἀντιφάνους ψευσμάτων. p. 115 : πολλαχοῦ δὲ παρακρούμενος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὁ Πυθέας κἀνταῦθ' αὖ ποὺ διέψευσται.

as a trustworthy historian and geographer. And yet we know that he took more correct views on various subjects of importance than Strabo had been able to gain with all his reading and inquiries. For example, he knew that the Caspian was an inland sea,¹ and did not, like Strabo, imagine that it was connected with the Northern Ocean² and the Palus Mæotis,³ an imagination which may have arisen from some imperfect accounts respecting the mouth of the Volga. With regard to Pytheas, there is little doubt that Strabo took his cue from Polybius, who was the great object of his admiration, and from whom he might learn any amount of censoriousness. Eratosthenes and Hipparchus received the statements of the Massilian navigator as worthy of credit,⁴ and modern scholars have vindicated at least the substantial truthfulness of his narratives.⁵

The *Geography* of Strabo is divided into seventeen books. The first *two* books contain a general introduction, in which the author reviews his principal predecessors, beginning with Homer and passing on to Anaximander, Hecataeus, Democritus, Eudoxus, Dicæarchus, Ephorus, Eratosthenes, Polybius, and Poseidonius. He also gives us his general notions of the figure and dimensions of the earth, and the climatology of the different zones. According to him, the earth is a globe, fixed in the centre of the universe,⁶ and its habitable portion resembles a military cloak (χλαμύς), and extends from Ireland to Ceylon.⁷

The description of Europe is contained in books 3—10; that of Asia in books 11—16; and the seventeenth book is devoted to Egypt and Libya.

In the *third* book he describes the Peninsula of Spain and Portugal, together with the Cassiterides and Balearic isles. His chief authorities were Artemidorus, Polybius, and Poseidonius, three eye-witnesses, but he also cites Ephorus, Eratosthenes, and others.⁸ In the *fourth* book he treats of Gaul, Britain,

¹ Herod. I. 202, 203, IV. 40.

² Strabo, pp. 74, 491, 507, 519.

³ *Id.* pp. 509, 510.

⁴ *Id.* pp. 71, 75, 148.

⁵ Bruckner, *de Pytheâ Massaliensi*, Gott. 1826. Fuhr, *de Pyth. Mass. Diss.* Darmst. 1835, and others.

⁶ pp. 11, 62, 94, 110, 713, 809.

⁷ pp. 118, 119: ἔστι δὴ τι χλαμυδοειδὲς σχῆμα γῆς τῆς οἰκουμένης.

⁸ Groskurd, p. XL.

Ireland, Thule, and the Alps, including the Ligurians, Rhætians, Vindelici, and other mountain tribes. His authorities are those which he followed in the third book, with the addition of Julius Cæsar, who is his chief text for Northern Gaul,¹ Aristotle, whom he probably used in his account of Marseilles,² Timagenes, to whom he makes a special reference for the booty taken by the Gauls from Delphi,³ and Pytheas, whom he cites with great distrust in speaking of Thule.⁴ In the *fifth* and *sixth* books he describes Italy and the adjoining islands, his authorities being Polybius and Poseidonius for Cisalpine Gaul and Liguria, and, for the peninsula itself, Artemidorus, Ephorus, Timæus, Fabius Pictor, and an anonymous chorographer (χωρογράφος), who is supposed by some⁵ to have been the M. Agrippa referred to by Pliny.⁶ The *seventh* book describes the nations on the lower Danube, and the countries mostly in the south of them, the portion relating to Macedonia and Thrace being unfortunately lost. For this book Strabo consulted Poseidonius, Polybius, Theopompus, Ephorus, and Aristotle. He also refers to Cineas.⁷ The *eighth* and *two following* books are given up to Greece and the neighbouring islands. Although Strabo used many prose authorities, his description is mainly based on Homer.

The *eleventh* and *five following* books are occupied with the description of Asia, considered according to the two main subdivisions of Eratosthenes⁸—the northern and the southern indicated by the range of the Taurus running from east to west. The northern subdivision is described in books 11—14; the southern in the fifteenth and sixteenth books. In the northern subdivision there are four parts: (a) the country between the Tanais, the Mæotis, the Euxine, and the Caspian; (b) the regions lying between the Caspian and the Scythians

¹ Groskurd, p. XLI.

² He must have derived from Aristotle's Πολιτεῖαι his account of the constitution of Massalia, p. 179. He was well acquainted with that work; p. 321.

³ Strabo, p. 188.

⁴ pp. 63, 114.

⁵ Heeren, *de fontibus Strabonis*, p. 22; French Translators of Strabo, III. p. 164. Groskurd (p. XLI.) shows that Agrippa's work could not have been published in time for Strabo's purpose, as it did not appear until after Agrippa's death.

⁶ *H. N.* III, § 17.

⁷ Strabo, p. 329.

⁸ pp. 490 sqq.

bordering on India; (c) the countries to the south of the Caucasus—Media, Armenia, and Cappadocia, as far as the Halys; (d) Asia Minor and the islands which belong to it. The first three of these parts are described in the eleventh book; Strabo was here at home, and could refer also to Theophanes, Metrodorus, Aristobulus, and others. The fourth part of Northern Asia, or Asia Minor and the islands, occupies three books, 12—14; and the geographer found abundant information in the older historians, and in the writings of those who had described the wars of Alexander and Mithridates. For Caria, in particular, he refers to a certain Philip of Theangela, near Halicarnassus,¹ whose ethnical designation has been confused with a title (εἰσαγγελεύς) given to the colonel-in-chief of the thousand horse-guards in Persia, who also acted as a sort of chamberlain and master of requests.²

In the fifteenth and sixteenth books he treats of the great southern subdivision of Asia,³ describing India and Persia in the former book, and in the latter Assyria, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, the Persian Gulf and Red Sea, Arabia and the coast of Æthiopia. His authorities were Eratosthenes, Megasthenes, Nearchus, Nicolas of Damascus, Patrocles, Aristobulus, and other writers about the campaigns of Alexander. He also got some special information respecting Arabia from his friend Athenodorus of Tarsus, who had been at Petra;⁴ and from Ælius Gallus, whom he had known in Egypt.⁵

The description of Africa is confined to the *seventeenth* book, which treats of Egypt, Æthiopia, Cyrene, Carthage, and Mauritania. He had travelled himself as far as Syene,⁶ and had lived some time in Alexandria,⁷ and his account of Egypt is

¹ Strabo, XIV. p. 662.

² See Dr. Thirlwall's paper on 'Philip of Theangela,' *Philolog. Mus.* I. pp. 373 sqq.

³ On his conjecture that another continent may have existed between the east of Asia and the west of Europe (I. p. 65, II. p. 118), see Humboldt, *Cosmos*, II. pp. 556, 7, Otte's Tr. 'It is astonishing,' says the great modern geographer, 'that this expression did not attract the attention of Spanish writers, who, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, believed that they everywhere in classical authors found the traces of a knowledge of the new world.'

⁴ Strabo, XVI. p. 779: ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος καὶ ἡμῶν ἑταῖρος.

⁵ *Id.* pp. 118, 806, 780—982. He was with Strabo at Thebes, p. 816.

⁶ *Id.* p. 118.

⁷ Above, p. 132, note 7.

very accurate and complete. For the parts which he had not visited, he referred to the usual ancient authorities on the subject of Libya. For the account of the oasis of Ammon he used the memoirs of Callisthenes, who accompanied Alexander to the temple there.¹ Petronius, who had carried on war in Æthiopia in the time of Augustus, furnished him with the latest information respecting that region.² He mentions Timosthenes, the admiral of Ptolemy Philadelphus;³ and quotes Hypsicrates,⁴ who had written on the zoology and botany of Libya. Although he mentions Juba, he does not appear to have been acquainted with his writings.

The style of Strabo, considering his age and country, is singularly good. It is simple, unadorned, and unaffected; and, though not of course pure Attic, it does not offend any reader of taste. The sentences are strung together by a constant repetition of the usual connecting particle (δέ), and there is no parade of the artificial structure of the period. Strabo has the great merit of always intending to be understood, and there are no difficulties in his text except where it is corrupt.

¹ Strabo, p. 814.

² *Id.* p. 820.

³ *Id.* p. 827.

⁴ *Id. ibid.* The common reading is Iphicrates, which has been corrected by Groskurd, p. 418, note.

CHAPTER LII.

NEW FLIGHT OF RHETORIC IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

§ 1. Formal establishment of the Sophistical Rhetoric in the second century. The School of Athens. § 2. Dion Chrysostomus. § 3. Herodes Atticus. § 4. Favorinus of Arles and Maximus of Tyre. § 5. Ælius Aristides. § 6. Hermogenes of Tarsus, and Hadrian of Tyre. § 7. The Philostrati. § 8. Grammarians.

§ 1. **T**HE tendency towards the establishment of a sophistical school-rhetoric, as the special form of professional literature, which had begun to manifest itself more than four centuries before Christ, reached its final development in the second century of our era. Many causes, which we have noted from time to time, had contributed to bring about this result. The last and most efficacious inducement to the special cultivation of rhetoric was found in the patronage which Hadrian and his immediate successors had bestowed upon Greek literature in general, and on this branch of it in particular. But the exigencies of the provincial law-courts of the Roman Empire had, even under the Cæsars, created a special demand for forensic eloquence, which was more and more influenced by the fine speaking of the school-men; and institutions for instruction in rhetoric had sprung up in the most distant and barbarous dependencies. Caligula had established at Lyons, in Gaul, a regular contest in Greek and Latin eloquence, in which the defeated candidates were compelled to confer rewards on the winners, and even to compose orations in their praise; while those who did worst were commanded to obliterate their own writings with a sponge or with their own tongues, unless they preferred to be chastised with rods or ducked in the Rhone.¹ Persius, who lived in the time of Nero, intimates that the cultivation of artificial rhetoric in his days had gone so far that a man could not defend himself from a criminal charge

¹ Sueton. *Caligula*, 20; Juven. I. 44.

without displaying his mastery over the figures of speech.¹ And Juvenal, who wrote at the end of the first century, tells us that seats of education in oratory were found in every province of the empire, that eloquent Gaul taught the lawyers of Britain, and that even the distant Thule was speaking of engaging a rhetorician.² The important place which technical oratory occupied among the studies of the most distinguished Romans is shown by the works of such writers as Seneca, Quintilian, Tacitus, and Pliny the younger. And while these and other masters represented the cultivation of Latin eloquence in Italy and in the provinces which spoke the Roman language, the same causes would promote and stimulate the Greek rhetoric, from which the Latin was derived, in Greece itself, and in those eastern dependencies of the empire which retained Greek as their vernacular or literary idiom. Juvenal tells us that Rome itself was full of Greek adventurers, especially Asiatic Greeks, who recommended themselves to patronage by their unrivalled versatility no less than by their dexterous flattery³ and unscrupulous complaisance. Among the recommendations of these candidates for preferment, he specially mentions the 'ready speech, more rapid and copious than that of Isæus.'⁴ And whatever effect their oratorical accomplishments may have produced on the success of these foreigners in private life, the honours conferred by Nerva on Dion Chrysostomus show that, under the better emperors who succeeded the Cæsars, a command

¹ I. 85 :

Fur es, ait Pedio. Pedius quid? crimina rasis
Librat in antithetis : doctas posuisse figuras
Laudatur.

² XV. 110 :

Nunc totus Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas.
Gallia cauidicos docuit facunda Britannos :
De conducendo loquitur jam rhetore Thule.

Cf. VII. 147. To say nothing of the Greek schools at Marseilles (Tac. *Agric.* 4), the full employment which Lucian found in Gaul shows that there was ample demand there for Greek rhetoric.

³ III. 58, sqq.

⁴ *Ibid.* 73, 4 :

Ingenium velox, audacia perditâ, sermo
Promptus et Isæo torrentior.

As we have mentioned above (chapter XLII. § 2, note) the Isæus referred to here was an Assyrian, contemporary with Juvenal.

of the resources of Greek eloquence was often a means of obtaining public advancement. But the formal patronage of the rhetorical schools in Greece, and their establishment on the old classic ground at Athens, was due to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Before his time, though the cultivation of Greek rhetoric was a necessary part of the education of every Roman who sought distinction in the Senate or the Forum, Athens was neither the only nor the principal seat of learning. Some sought teachers at Marseilles, others at Rhodes, others at Alexandria; Augustus was sent by his great uncle to Apollonia; and Tarsus, one of the most flourishing of these schools, was filled, for the most part, by native students. All these and other Universities, if we may use the modern term, sent their best professors to Rome; and in the reign of Vespasian due provision was made there for the remuneration of the Greek rhetorical teachers.¹ But under Hadrian a new period began for Greece itself. That emperor had a very decided partiality for Athens.² He resided there for three years, and did all that he could to assume the character of an Athenian;³ he was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, and acted both as *agonothetes* in the public games and as *archon eponymus*.⁴ He beautified the city with new buildings,⁵ and the Olympieion, of which a few stately columns still remain, was a monument of his attachment to the city of Pericles.⁶ For our present purpose it is most important to mention that he provided for the revival or encouragement of the philosophical and rhetorical studies, which he considered proper to this old seat of learning. The *Pandects* contain a reference to a constitution by which he had at the beginning of his reign⁷ made arrangements for the

¹ Sueton. *Vespas.* 18: 'Ingenia et artes vel maxime fovit: primus e fisco Latinis Græcisque Rhetoribus annua centena constituit.'

² Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* II. 10, pp. 585 sqq.

³ He wrote a poem called *Catachanæ*, in imitation of Antimachus: above, chapter XXX. *ad fin.*

⁴ See Niebuhr's *Lectures*, II. p. 267.

⁵ Pausan. I. 18, § 9.

⁶ Wordsworth's *Athens and Attica*, p. 155: 'The temple of Jupiter Olympius was one of the first conceived and the last executed of the sacred monuments of Athens. It was reserved to a Roman Emperor, Hadrian, to finish the work. This gigantic fabric stood, therefore, on its vast site, as a striking proof of the power of Rome, exerted at a distance from Rome on the Athenian soil.'

⁷ L. XXVII. t. 1. c. 6, quoted in an excellent article on 'the School of Athens

enjoyment of certain privileges by four classes of persons—philosophers, rhetoricians, grammarians, and physicians. These arrangements were intended to apply to all the provinces of the empire. But they gained a special signification for Athens in the reign of Antoninus Pius.¹ And Marcus Aurelius formally established in Athens alone two public schools, one for philosophy and the other for rhetoric, which were united in a kind of University. There was a similar institution at Rome, founded by Hadrian, and not inappropriately termed the *Athenæum*.² The philosophical school had four professorial chairs (*θρόνοι*), one for each of the principal sects—the Platonics, Stoics, Peripatetics, and Epicureans. In the rhetorical school there were two chairs, the sophistical and the political, the former being emphatically called ‘the chair’ (*ὁ θρόνος*),³ the latter having a lower salary, and being of inferior importance. That the rhetorical professor was at the head of the University appears from the description of his functions. He was to take the lead of the youth of Athens,⁴ and had the full power of adjudication and direction. Besides this, while the emperor committed the selection of the four philosophical professors to Herodes Atticus,⁵ he reserved that of the rhetorical teacher to himself, and made the first appointment in favour of Theodotus.⁶ Although there was much competition for all these chairs, it was in the department of rhetoric that the greatest renown and profit were attainable, and the title ‘Sophist,’ with an extension of its old meaning, became an honourable distinction, amounting, in fact, to that of ‘doctor’ in the Middle Ages.⁷ To Athens, as to the great centre of sophistry, the

during the decline of the Roman empire’ (*Journal of Education*, vol. I. p. 245) attributed to Dr. Thirlwall.

¹ Westermann, *Gesch. der Beredsamkeit*, § 89.

² Casaubon, *ad Capitol. Pertin.* 11; Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* pp. 580, 589, 627, ed. Olearius.

³ Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* I. 23, p. 526, II. 12, p. 593, II. 19, p. 599.

⁴ *Id.* l.c. II. 2, p. 566: *προέστη δὲ* (Theodotus) *καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων νεότητος πρῶτος*.

⁵ *Id.* *ibid.*

⁶ See the note of Olearius, p. 567. The emperor called Theodotus: *ἀγωνιστῆν τῶν πολιτικῶν λόγων καὶ ῥητορικῆς ἑφέλος*.

⁷ Originally *σοφιστής* was only an extension of *σοφός* (Herod. I. 29, IV. 95; Isocr. *De Permut.* § 235; Diog. Laërt. I. 14); then, as *σοφός* might signify a poet

Greek rhetoricians flocked from all quarters. Here they laid the foundations of their acquirements and of their reputation; and then they travelled through the provinces of the empire, declaiming in temples and theatres,¹ and not unfrequently provoking contests of eloquence in some great city.² For these efforts they expected not only applause but remuneration, and, in the modern phrase, they often sent round their hats to receive the contributions of their audience. They were, in fact, itinerant popular preachers, but they had no great doctrines to teach, no new truths to deliver. Personal vanity and professional ambition were their leading motives, and in pursuit of these objects they ostentatiously claimed an unlimited productiveness, which soon produced its natural effects on their style and language—effects which were the more sensibly felt because the pure Attic idiom was no longer vernacular, but had to be reproduced by imitation of the ancient writers.³ Weak, vapid, tasteless harangues, the outpourings of commonplace thoughts in affected and conventional diction, constituted at this time a large part of the literature of Greece,⁴ and we retain many specimens of it at the expense of much that was infinitely more valuable. It will not be worth while in this chapter to enumerate all the names of the rhetoricians of the second century. We shall be content to give an account of some of the principal sophists as they appeared in succession, beginning with Dion Chrysostomus, who flourished at the commencement of this period or a little before it, and concluding with the great technist Hermogenes, and the Philostrati, to whom we owe our biographies of these artificial orators.

or any other artist (Pind. *Ol.* I. 9), σοφιστῆς denoted any τεχνίτης in a good or bad sense (Blomfield, *ad Prom.* 62); it got a special application, like the word τέχνη itself, to skill in words (Thucyd. III. 38; Plutarch, *Themist.* 2); and from the time of Philostratus downwards (see *Vit. Soph. Proœm.* pp. 480-484, Olear., cf. *Themist.* XXIII. p. 286, B.C. Harduin), indicated completeness of academical proficiency, till in the middle ages we have such designations as (Baldricus, *apud Ducang.* s.v.):

Egregius Doctor magnusque Sophista Geraldus.

¹ Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* pp. 571, 580, Olear.

² *Id.* pp. 525, 538, 571, 601; Liban. I. pp. 11, Reiske.

³ Plut. *De Audit.* VI. p. 166, Reiske; Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* pp. 553, 598, 624.

⁴ Lucian, *Rhet. Prœcept.* 11 sqq.; Plut. *De Audit.* p. 149 sqq.

§ 2. DION called CHRYSOSTOMUS, 'the golden-mouthed,' from his eloquence,¹ and COCCEIANUS² from the patronage of the emperor Cocceius Nerva,³ or of Salvius Cocceianus,⁴ was the son of Pasicrates, a man of equestrian rank at Prusa in Bithynia. He was born about the middle of the first century A.D.⁵ We do not hear that he received instruction from any noted rhetorician or philosopher. But in his own country and at an early age he obtained some reputation as a composer of political and philosophical essays. He travelled at least as far as Egypt, where he is said to have met Vespasian, then on his way to Rome. He either accompanied the new emperor to Italy, or followed him there, and was established at Rome in the time of Domitian. Like other eminent men he incurred the suspicion of that odious tyrant, and it is to be inferred from his own words⁶ that he was banished from Rome and from his own country in consequence of his connexion and intimacy with a near relation of the emperor, probably T. Flavius Sabinus,⁷ the son-in-law of Titus and first-cousin of Domitian, who was put to death in A.D. 82.⁸ By the advice of the oracle at Delphi he assumed the dress of a beggar,⁹ and with nothing in his pocket but Plato's *Phædo* and Demosthenes 'on the embassy,'¹⁰ he entered upon a long course of wanderings. In the first summer he went to the Borysthenes, and traversed the country of the Scythians and Getæ;¹¹ he afterwards made journeys in various countries

¹ Themist. *Orat.* V. p. 63 D : Δίωνα τὸν χρυσοῦν τὴν γλῶτταν.

² Plin. *Epist. ad Trajan.* 85, 86.

³ Valesius, *Emendat. ed. Burmann*, pp. 43—47.

⁴ Sueton. *Domit.* 10; Emperius, *De exilio Dionis Chrysostomi*, p. 104: 'an Salvius Cocceianus et Dionis patronus et causa fuit exilii? nam quod existimant a Nervæ Cocceiani nomen accepisse Dionem idoneo argumento doceri nequit.'

⁵ For the life of Dion, we have Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* I. 7, p. 487 sq.; Photius, *Cod.* CCIX.; Suid. s.v.; Synesius: Δίων ἢ περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν διαγωγῆς (see below, chapter LVIII.); Arethas and Theodorus Melochita (in Dindorf's *Dion*, II. pp. 361 sqq., § 9); and in a modern form, Valesius, *Emendat.* II. 1, prefixed to Dindorf's edition of *Dion*, I. pp. XXX. sqq.; Kayser, *ad Philostr.*, *Vit. Soph.* p. 172 sq.; *ap. Dindorf. ibid.* pp. XXXVI. sqq.; Emperius, u.s.

⁶ *Orat.* XIII. p. 418, II.; Reiske, I. p. 240, Dindorf: ὅτε φεύγειν συνέβη με φιλίας ἔνεκεν λεγομένης ἀνδρὸς οὐ πονηροῦ τῶν δὲ τότε εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων ἐγγύτατα ὄντος, διὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἀποθανόντος.

⁷ Emperius, u.s. pp. 104, 105.

⁸ Sueton. *Dom.* 10, 15.

⁹ Dio. Chrys. *Orat.* XIII. p. 243, Dind.

¹⁰ Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* p. 488.

¹¹ Dio. Chrys. *Orat.* XXXVI. II. p. 48, Dind.; Philostrat. u.s.

to the north and east. Everywhere, when he fell in with a Greek population, he seems to have displayed his oratorical powers with great effect, and many of the speeches, in which he declaimed freely against the tyrant of Rome, are still preserved. He happened to be near the camp on the Danube when Domitian was assassinated,¹ and persuaded the soldiers to assent to the senate's choice of his friend Nerva. He now returned to Rome,² and both Nerva and Trajan treated him with the greatest distinction.³ With the exception of a visit to his native place, about A.D. 100,⁴ he spent the rest of his life in Italy, and died at Rome, full of years and honours, about A.D. 117.⁵

Eighty orations have come down to us in the name of Dion Chrysostomus, all belonging to the later period of his life, when he had raised himself above the common places of contemporary rhetoricians by a study of the Stoic philosophy. It is not certain that all these speeches were composed by Dion, and an able attempt has been made by a modern critic to show that the Corinthian speech, which was certainly not written by Dion, was the work of Favorinus.⁶ Both in their style and subject-matter, these compositions are more attractive and interesting than most works of the same class. Dion had formed his language on a careful study not only, as we have seen, of Plato and Demosthenes,⁷ but also of Æschines and Hypereides, whom he specially recommends to the student of oratory,⁸ and, with occasional faults, it is on the whole unaffected and perspicuous.

¹ Philostr. *u.s.*

² *Orat.* XLV. p. 118.

³ Trajan used to take him as his companion in his triumphal chariot, and often turning to him, remarked: *τί μὲν λέγεις οὐκ οἶδα, φιλῶ δέ σε ὡς ἐμυτὸν* (Philostr. p. 488; Photius, *u.s.*, Suid. *s.v.*).

⁴ *Orat.* XL. p. 90, Dind.

⁵ Westermann, *Gesch. d. Bereds.* § 87, has suggested this date; Kayser (p. XXXVII. Dind.) says: 'Romam reversus quamdiu ibi fuerit, quando obierit nescimus, nec ubi mortuus sit constat.'

⁶ Adolphus Emperius, *De oratione Corinthiacâ falso Dioni Chrysostomo adscriptâ*, Opuscula, ed. Schneidewin, pp. 18, sqq. Dindorf places it at the end of his edition as 'Anonymi Corinthiaca.'

⁷ Philostr. p. 488.

⁸ *Orat.* XVIII. p. 283, Dind. He particularly praises Thucydides (p. 282), and often imitates even his most peculiar phrases. Thus we have, *Orat.* LIII. p. 166, Dind.: *τοσοῦτον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιημάτων πορίζοντα ὅσον ἀποζῆν*, from Thucyd. I. 2.

It was recommended by an agreeable delivery,¹ and his powers as an extempore speaker were unrivalled.² The subjects of his speeches are very various. Sometimes he speaks about his own personal affairs, as in the speech on Borysthenes (Βορυσθηνητικὸς λόγος), in which he gives an account of his travels, and details a conversation on providence in which he had taken a part. In his 'Diogenes, or on tyranny,' he points out the miseries of the despot, with reference, no doubt, to Domitian; and in his discourses 'on monarchy,' he directly praises Trajan. The Stoical principles discussed by Cicero in his *Paradoxa* and *Tusculanæ* are treated similarly in the discourses 'on slavery,' 'on freedom,' 'on pain.' The essay 'on the exercise of eloquence,' (περὶ λόγου ἀσκήσεως) is an interesting attempt to guide the reading of a rhetorical student. His 'Trojan speech' is a piece of critical scepticism, and undertakes to prove that Troy never was taken by the Greeks. And his 'Rhodian oration,' which is the most admired of all his efforts, is an argument against the practice of adopting ancient statues with new inscriptions, instead of authentic portraits of those whom it was intended to honour by a public monument.³

Besides the eighty speeches, which are preserved entire, we have fragments or the titles of thirteen others; and Dion is said also to have written four books in defence of Homer against Plato; eight books on the virtues of Alexander; epistles, five of which seem to be extant; and a history of the Getae, which Philostratus ascribes to Dion Chrysostomus and Suidas to Dion Cassius, his grandson.⁴

§ 3. TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS ATTICUS HERODES, commonly called HERODES ATTICUS,⁵ was born about A.D. 103 at Marathon, in

¹ Phot. *Cod.* CCIX.: φωνὴν δ' ἡρεμιαλαν ἠφλει καὶ σταθεράν, where we are told that he was a little man, and sometimes wore a lion's skin when he was speaking.

² Philostr. *Vit. Apollon.* V. 37, p. 222: προσῆν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ αὐτοσχεδιάζειν ἄριστα ἀνθρώπων.

³ Niebuhr has eulogized Dion in glowing terms in his sixty-eighth Lecture (II. p. 263, Schmitz).

⁴ See the catalogue of Dion's works in Westermann, *Gesch. der Bereds.* pp. 317-321.

⁵ For the life of Herodes, we have Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* II. 1, p. 545 sqq. and Suidas, s.v., who says that he was called *Julius*, and that his father's name was *Plutarchus*. The latter is called *Atticus*, and the grandfather *Hipparchus* by Philostratus, p. 547.

Attica. His family boasted of mythological antiquity;¹ his father Atticus had become enormously rich by the discovery of a treasure on his estate, of which he was allowed to retain possession;² and Herodes increased his fortune by a marriage with the heiress Annia Regilla.³ Of his ample means he made the most magnificent use. Not contented with redeeming his father's legacy of an annual payment of a mina to each Athenian citizen by paying down at once five minas a head,⁴ he did more at his own expense for the embellishment of Athens than any one who had used the public funds for that purpose.⁵ He almost exhausted the quarries of Pentelicus in the construction of his stadium; and he built in honour of his wife a theatre called Regilla of which the roof was of cedar-wood: Philostratus describes these two buildings as the most magnificent structures in the Roman Empire.⁶ The marks of his opulence and liberality were seen in other parts of Greece and even in Italy. Theatres, hippodromes, aqueducts, and hospitals rose on both sides of the Gulf of Corinth; he rebuilt decayed towns, within and without the Peloponnesus; and was only restrained by a fear of offending the Romans, from undertaking a canal across the Isthmus, which Nero had projected and relinquished.⁷ In Italy, too, he exhibited the same munificence, and supplied Canusium with water,⁸ which in Horace's time was a rare commodity in that district.⁹ He had received the best education in

¹ He claimed descent from the Æacidæ, *i.e.* probably from Ajax; see Olearius, *ad Philostr.* p. 546.

² Philostr. p. 547.

³ She was the sister of a noble Roman, M. Attilius Regulus Bradua, *Regilla* being formed from *Regulus*, like *Drusilla* from *Drusulus* and *Drusus*: see Olearius, *ad Philostr.* p. 555.

⁴ Philostr. p. 549.

⁵ Pausanias makes frequent mention of his buildings (see II. 17, VI. 21. 2, VII. 20. 3, X. 32. 1.).

⁶ p. 551: δύο μὲν δὴ ταῦτα Ἀθήνησιν, οἷα οὐχ ἐτέρωθι τῆς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις.

⁷ Philostr. pp. 551, 552: ὡς μὴ διαβληθεῖη διανοίας δοκεῖν ἄπτεσθαι ἢ μηδὲ Νέρων ἤρκεσεν.

⁸ *Id.* p. 552: ὦνῃσε δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ Κανύσιον ἡμερώσας ὕδατι μάλα τοῦτον δεόμενον. It was probably an aqueduct, as Gibbon suggests (I. p. 184, ed. W. Smith).

⁹ Shortly before Canusium, Horace mentions (*I. Serm.* V. 88) a place, supposed to be *Equus Tuticus*, where *venit vilissima rerum aqua*, and of Canusium itself he adds (v. 91) that it is *aquæ non ditior urna* than that place.

rhetoric and philosophy that Athens could furnish,¹ and his abilities were on a par with his learning and wealth. Such a man, under the Antonines, was sure to be promoted to high offices. When quite young, he was placed at the head of the free towns in Asia.² After this he was appointed president (ἀρχιερέυς) of the Panathenaic and Panhellenic festivals,³ and of the religious solemnities in honour of M. Aurelius and L. Verus, the latter of whom had been his pupil.⁴ In A.D. 143 he was consul with C. Bellicius Torquatus.⁵ His continued residence in his native country was subsequent to this. In spite of his munificence, he found bitter enemies at Athens, and he was attacked both in his public and private capacity by malignant slanderers.⁶ He refuted the charges brought against him: but he became disgusted with Athens, and retired to his villa Cephisia near Marathon,⁷ where he died, it is said at the age of seventy-six, in A.D. 180.⁸ The latter part of his life was devoted to the rhetorical studies, which had always been one of his favourite occupations. He was surrounded by a crowd of admiring pupils, many of whom became eminent sophists.⁹ His powers as a speaker seem to have been extraordinary—he is called ‘the king of speeches,’¹⁰ ‘one of the ten,’¹¹ ‘the tongue of Greece and Athens.’¹² He spoke much more than he wrote;¹³ but we hear of many of his written compositions,¹⁴ all of which

¹ His teachers were Polemo, Favorinus, Scopelianus, and Secundus. Philostrat. p. 564.

² *Id.* p. 548, 554.

³ *Id.* p. 549.

⁴ Capito, *Verus*, 2; Philostr. p. 561.

⁵ He is called ὕπατος in an inscription found at Megara, Böckh, *Corp. Inscr.* I. no. 1077.

⁶ Philostr. pp. 555, 559 sqq.

⁷ Aul. Gell. *N. I.* 2, XVIII. 10; Philostr. p. 562.

⁸ Philostr. p. 565.

⁹ Besides Verus and M. Antoninus he taught Aristeides, Hadrian of Tyre, Chrestus of Byzantium, Pausanias of Cæsarea, and the Roman Aulus Gellius.

¹⁰ βασιλεὺς λόγων, Philostr. pp. 581, 598.

¹¹ εἰς τῶν δέκα, *Id.* p. 564.

¹² Ἑλλήνων γλῶττα, *Id. ibid.* γλῶσσα Ἀθηνέων, *Inscr. Triop.* II. v. 37, Böckh, *C. I.* III. p. 919.

¹³ Aul. Gellius, *N.A.* IX. 2, XIX. 12.

¹⁴ They are called ἐφημερίδες, σύγγραμμα πολυμαθές, ἐπιστολαί, λόγοι αὐτοσχέδιοι, and διαλέξεις. One of the latter, περὶ γάμου συμβιώσεως is quoted by the *Etym. M.* s. v. ἄρσην. On the nature of a διάλεξις as opposed to ἀμελέτη, see Emperius, *Opuscula*, p. 24.

unfortunately are lost. An oration 'on government' (*περὶ πολιτείας*), is ascribed to him, but its genuineness is very doubtful.¹ An attempt has been made² to show that he was the author of the declamation 'in defence of Palamedes,'³ but without much success. All that we really have from his pen are a few inscriptions,⁴ one in fifty-nine hexameters in honour of his wife Regilla.⁵

§ 4. Two of these rhetoricians claim to be considered as philosophers, but their proper place is in the class which is now before us.

FAVORINUS, a native of Arles in Provence,⁶ was not prevented by his bodily defects⁷ from gaining a great reputation as a speaker. He was educated at Rome, and had the advantage of receiving instructions from Dion Chrysostomus.⁸ As we have seen, the Corinthian oration ascribed to that sophist, is assigned to Favorinus by the most recent critical editor of his teacher. Professional rivalry brought him into antagonism with Polemo of Smyrna,⁹ but he lived on terms of friendship and mutual respect with some of the most eminent of his contemporaries. The emperor Hadrian regarded him with special favour, which was not altogether disturbed even by their rhetorical rivalry.¹⁰ He was intimately acquainted with Herodes Atticus, to whom he left his house and library at Rome.¹¹ Fronto and Demetrius the Cynic are mentioned among his friends; and Plutarch

¹ It is printed in Bekker's *Oratores Attici*, vol. V.

² By Foss, *de Gorgiâ Leontino*, Halle, 1828, p. 100 sqq.

³ *ὑπὲρ Παλαμήδους ἀπολογία*, Bekker, u.s. pp. 62 sqq.

⁴ On the inscriptions belonging to his estate at Triopeum, and found near Athens, see Böckh, *Corp. Inscr.* I. p. 45, III. pp. 916 sqq.

⁵ Fiorillo, *Herodis Attici quæ supersunt*, Lips. 1801, pp. 38 sqq.

⁶ His life is given by Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* p. 489, Olear.

⁷ Lucian, *Eumuch.* 7: καὶ τις Ἀκαδημαϊκὸς εὐνοῦχος ἐκ Κελτῶν ὀλίγου πρὸ ἡμῶν εὐδοκμήσας ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. Cf. *Demonax*, 12, Philostr. p. 541.

⁸ Philostr. p. 490, Olear.

⁹ *Id.* p. 491.

¹⁰ *Id.* p. 490; Spartian. *Hadri.* c. 15. The Athenians, however, punished him for his literary antagonism to the Emperor by throwing down his statue. Philostr. p. 490: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ δεινὰ (not δεινός, as Olearius reads) ἐφαίνετο καὶ συνδραμόντες αὐτοί, μάλιστα οἱ ἐν τέλει Ἀθηναῖοι, χαλκῇν εἰκόνα κατέβαλον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὡς πολεμωτάτου τῷ αὐτοκράτορι. Favorinus used to boast of his three distinctions: Γαλάτης ὢν ἐλληνίζειν· εὐνοῦχος ὢν μοιχείας κρίνεσθαι· βασιλεῖ διαφέρεισθαι καὶ ζῆν.

¹¹ Philostr. p. 490.

dedicated to him the extant treatise 'on cold'¹ and a lost tract 'on friendship.' As a philosopher, Favorinus adopted the scepticism of the Academy,² and wrote three books dedicated to Hadrian, Dryson, and Aristarchus, respectively, on the old subject of 'convincing conception' (περὶ καταληπτικῆς φαντασίας).³ Other works of the same kind were his 'Plutarch, or on the condition of the Academy' (Πλούταρχος ἡ περὶ τῆς Ακαδημικῆς διαθέσεως)⁴ and ten books entitled 'Pyrrhonian modes,' (Πυρρώνειων τρόπων)⁵ and written, as Gellius tells us,⁶ with much subtlety and logic. Of these and other works of great variety and extent, we have not even any fragments. But we can see from the manner in which Favorinus is mentioned by Galen and others that he was a very considerable person in his day.⁷

MAXIMUS of Tyre,⁸ who was a Platonic philosopher as well as a rhetorician, must be distinguished from the Stoic Claudius Maximus, whom M. Aurelius mentions as his teacher.⁹ We still have from him forty-one rhetorico-philosophical essays, called by the same name as the lost 'discourses' (διαλέξεις, λόγοι) of Herodes Atticus. These essays, which are written with a sort of ostentatious elegance, have attracted a good deal of attention in modern times. Their subjects are those which occupied the later Platonists—moral questions of a practical nature, discussions 'on the secret monitor of Socrates,' 'on the nature of God,' 'on the object of philosophy,' 'the uses of adversity,' 'the origin of evil,' and the like. Maximus was a teacher of rhetoric, and if 'the funeral discourse'¹⁰ on Paris of Troy, mentioned by Libanius, was one of his exertions, he must have belonged to precisely the same class as the sophists commemorated by Philostratus. Suidas says that Maximus resided at Rome in the time of Commodus, and the Paris

¹ περὶ τοῦ πρώτου ψυχροῦ, II. p. 945 sqq.

² Aul. Gell. N. A. XI. 5, XX. 1.

³ Galen, I. p. 6.

⁴ *Id. ibid.*

⁵ Philostr. p. 491.

⁶ XI. 5.

⁷ He was an Attic purist (Galen, *de Opt. Gen. Dic.* II. p. 17: Φαβωρίνος—*eis tēn' Attikēn phōnēn eiōthōs metalaμβάνειν ἕκαστον τῶν ὀνομάτων*), but his diction was weak and effeminate (Lucian, *Demon.* 12).

⁸ Suidas, s.v.

⁹ See, however, Tillemont, *Hist. d. Emp.* II. pp. 330, 550.

¹⁰ Ἐντάφιος λόγος, Liban. *Orat.* XIX. *pro Saltatoribus.*

manuscript of his dissertations speaks of his 'first residence' in that city.¹ There are no Roman allusions in these discourses, but many references to his travels in Greece and Asia Minor.² He was probably one of the professors in the school at Athens.³

§ 5. No one of the sophists of this age is better known than PUBLIUS ÆLIUS ARISTEIDES, surnamed *Theodorus*,⁴ who was born at Adriani, in Mysia, in A.D. 129, or, according to another inference,⁵ in A.D. 117. His father Eudæmon was a priest of Jupiter; and Aristeides, who combined a regard for the old mythologies of the Greeks with an ardent pursuit of the sophistry of his own age, became ultimately a priest of Æsculapius at Smyrna,⁶ which, by his influence with M. Aurelius, he got rebuilt after its destruction by an earthquake in A.D. 178;⁷ and he died there about A.D. 180.⁸ A sickly constitution when young, and an illness of thirteen years' duration in maturer life, had created in him a sort of superstitious seriousness. He may be regarded as in some sort the popular preacher of the old religion of Greece, and he finished his career very appropriately as a votary of the god of health. He received an excellent education. At Athens he studied under Herodes Atticus, at Pergamus under Aristocles, and under Polemon at Smyrna.⁹ He spread his reputation by tours through all the countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, where displays of Greek

¹ The title there given is: Μαξίμου Τυρίου Πλατωνικοῦ φιλοσόφου τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαλέξεων τῆς πρώτης ἐπιδημίας λόγους μὲν. See Dübner, *Præf.* p. IX.: 'inscriptio ita concepta in Codice.'

² For example, see *Dissert.* VIII. 8, p. 30, Dübner, where he mentions the Marsyas and the Mæander, and adds: εἶδον τοὺς ποτάμους.

³ In *Diss.* VIII. 7, p. 25, Dübner, he addresses the young in a boastful and epideictic vein, quite worthy of a rhetorical professor, and with regard to rhetoric in particular he says: εἰ τε τις ῥητορείας ἐρᾷ οὗτος αὐτῷ δρόμος λόγου πρόχειρος κ. τ. λ.

⁴ The authorities for the life of Aristeides, besides his own speeches, and the Prolegomena to them by Sopater of Apamea (ed. Dind. III. pp. 736-757) are the biography in Philostratus, II. 9, pp. 581-585; Suidas, s.v.; Masson's *Collectanea Historica*, ap. Dind.

⁵ Letronne, *Recherches pour servir à l'Hist. de l'Egypt*, 254 sqq.

⁶ He had been elected priest at an earlier period, but had not considered himself authorized by the god to accept the office: see Masson, *Collect.* p. XCII. sqq., Dind.

⁷ Aristeid. *Ep. ad M. Aurel. et Commod.* I. pp. 762-768, Dindorf.

⁸ Philostr. p. 585.

⁹ See Masson, *Collect.* § IV. p. XXII. sqq., Dind.

rhetoric were likely to be appreciated, and his hearers bestowed upon him all the usual marks of enthusiastic admiration. Statues in his honour were erected in many cities,¹ just as prints of popular preachers are exhibited in our own shop windows. And some of them, with appropriate inscriptions, are still extant. His contemporaries and successors have given literary permanence to the general voice of praise. Philostratus calls him the most skilled in art (τεχνικώτατος) of all the sophists, and says that he abounded in original thoughts (θεωρήμασι), although he did not excel in extempore speaking.² Libanius bursts forth into the exclamation that he prefers the oratorical excellencies of Aristides to the wealth of Midas, and looks for no higher praise himself than to be considered like that great rhetorician.³ Longinus, as quoted by Sopater,⁴ speaks in the highest praise of his copiousness and subtlety; and Thomas Magister classes him alone with Homer, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Plato.⁵ This admiration for Aristides has led to the preservation of more than an adequate specimen of his oratorical powers. We have no less than fifty-five declamations bearing his name, besides two rhetorical treatises; and he is illustrated with prolegomena and scholia like the great writers of antiquity. We quite agree with the most recent editor of Aristides in deprecating the care which has been bestowed on the preservation of this rhetorician, at the expense, it is to be feared, of many better writers,

¹ Liban. *Epist.* 1551, p. 701; Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* p. 582; Visconti, *Iconogr. Gr.* I. pl. 31. p. 268 sqq.; Winckelmann, II. p. 475, Fr. ed. The writer of the article on Aristides in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, vol. II. p. 325, supposes that the statue found in the ruins of Herculaneum, and now in the *Museo Borbonico*, which Finati (vol. I. plate L) ascribes to Aristides the Just, belongs to Ælius Aristides. His reasons are, a comparison of the head with the bust in the Vatican referred to by Visconti and Winckelmann, and a belief that the attitude is somewhat affected. He has overlooked the fatal objection to this conjecture, namely, that Herculaneum was buried under the volcanic *débris* in A.D. 79, and that Ælius Aristides was not born till 38 years afterwards, on the earliest calculation, so that his statue could hardly have been there. In a paper read before the Cambridge Philosophical Society in Feb. 1858 (*Transactions*, vol. X. part I.), we have endeavoured to prove that the statue in question is the representation of Solon in the attitude ascribed to him by Æschines and Demosthenes.

² *Vit. Soph.* II. 7, p. 585, Olear.: καὶ τεχνικώτατος δὲ σοφιστῶν ὁ Ἀριστείδης ἐγένετο καὶ πολὺς ἐν θεωρήμασι, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦ σχεδιάζειν ἀπηνέχθη.

³ *Orat. pro Saltatoribus*, p. 475, quoted in Dindorf's *Aristides*, III. p. 772.

⁴ p. 741, Dind.

⁵ *Attic. Eclog.* s.v. ἐκεῖ.

who were undervalued in comparison with him.¹ Without denying him a certain amount of merit, for he is free from some of the worst faults of his contemporaries, we must profess our conviction that no one will derive much pleasure or profit from a perusal of his superficial harangues;² and we should have been quite content with possessing one or two of the best among them, as samples of the second-rate eloquence, which was considered unrivalled in the days of the Antonines. For instance, it might have been worth while to have his speech on the same subject as that of Demosthenes against Leptines, in order to see by contrast the perfection of the original, and the worthlessness of the imitation.³

The subjects adopted by Aristeides are just those which would be popular enough at the time, and of no interest to after ages. They are sometimes panegyrics on the cities in which they were delivered, like the *Panathenaicus* of Isocrates, which he has directly imitated; sometimes discourses in praise of certain divinities—heathen sermons, in fact; sometimes imaginary speeches derived from the older history of Greece, or even from epic poetry; sometimes he ventures to assume the mask of Demosthenes or Æschines, to whom he considered himself at least equal.⁴ He has written about four hundred pages to defend rhetoric against the strictures in Plato's *Gorgias*. One of his discourses is in the form of a letter to M. Aurelius, and was an effective charity sermon for the distressed people of Smyrna. His six 'sacred discourses' (ἱεροὶ λόγοι) are interesting as an account of the incubations in

¹ Dindorf, *Præfatio*, p. III: 'neque enim is scriptor est Aristides, cui diutius quis immoretur, mirarique licet veterum magistrorum judicium—qui si seposito Aristide ad oratorum Atticorum monumenta, quorum maxima pars neglecta interiit, operam convertissent, et recto judicio usi fuisse viderentur, neque irreparabilem antiquitatis studiis jacturam intulissent.'

² Niebuhr (*Lectures*, II. p. 272) dismisses him with the brief description: 'Ælius Aristides, whose declamations must be disagreeable to every unprejudiced reader.'

³ F. A. Wolf, who has printed the two together, says (p. XXVI): 'mihi perquam vile et contemnendum visum est,' and adds (p. XXVII): 'omnino me meus genius avertet, spero, ab hoc toto genere imitatorum, donec meliores et meliorum sæculorum scriptores supererunt, qui vel emendari vel illustrari possant.'

⁴ To show his good opinion of himself, it may be sufficient to mention that he once said to M. Aurelius: ἡμεῖς τῶν ἐμούντων οὐκ ἐσμὲν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων καὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων (*Proleg.* p. 738, Dind.; *Philostr.* p. 583).

Asclepeia, to which he submitted during his long illness. He describes how he used to deliver prescriptions for his own malady before a number of witnesses while he was in a state of somnambulism, or, as we should say, mesmeric trance.¹ When we remember that he died a priest of Æsculapius, we may perhaps be disposed to think that there was some collusion between him and the priest-physicians, whose aid he sought.² There is nothing in the character or career of Aristeides, or in the profession to which he belonged, which can serve as a guarantee for his freedom from either enthusiasm or imposture.

§ 6. The greatest technologist of the period now under consideration was HERMOGENES, the son of Calippus of Tarsus.³ The year of his birth is not known, but he was only fifteen when the fame of his precocious genius as an extempore speaker led the emperor M. Aurelius to send for him, and he introduced himself by saying, ‘Behold, I am come to you, O prince, an orator requiring a pedagogue, an orator still looking forward to maturity.’⁴ Soon after this he became a public teacher of rhetoric. His first work was published at seventeen, and he seems to have pursued his literary labours with such zeal that his intellectual vigour came to a sudden end at the age of twenty-five,⁵ and the rest of his long life was spent in a sort of helpless imbecility.⁶ Even in this short career he succeeded in making himself the great authority in the art of speaking; his surname *ξυστήρ*, ‘the graving tool or polisher,’ indicates that

¹ Hydropathy entered largely into the system of treatment, and was sometimes carried to an extravagant extent; see, for example, *ιερώων λόγος β’*, p. 479, Dind.

² When he contrasts the ill success which attended the advice of his human counsellors, with the invariable benefit which resulted from the same prescriptions when they proceeded from the god, we cannot fail to detect a wish to cry up the system in which he eventually took a part. He says (p. 484, Dind.): τὸ γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν διαίταν καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα, ὅποτε μὲν ὁ θεὸς ἡγοῖτό τε καὶ διαρρήδην εἶποι, σωτηρίαν, ἰσχύν, κοφύτητα, ῥαστώνην, εὐθυμίαν, πάντα τὰ κάλλιστα τῷ σώματι καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ φέρειν, ἄλλου δὲ τοῦ συμβουλευσάμενου καὶ μὴ στοχασαμένου τῆς γνώμης τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα τάναντία τοῦτοις ἐπιφέρειν, πῶς οὐ μέγιστον σημεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δυνάμεως;

³ We have notices of his life in Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* II. 7, p. 577 sq., Suidas, s.v., who copies the former, and the scholiast on Hermog. *περὶ στάσεων*, quoted by Olearius, *ad Phil.* u.s.

⁴ Philostr. p. 578.

⁵ Schol. ad Hermog. u.s.

⁶ Hence Antiochus the Sophist said of him: οὗτος Ἑρμογένης ὁ ἐν παισὶ μὲν γέρων, ἐν δὲ γέρουσι παῖς.

his rules were thought sufficient to remove all external roughness from the style of his pupils; and his works were for a long time the established manuals of instruction, and formed the text-books for many commentaries. He was, in fact, regarded as the wonder of his age, and the belief that he had transcended the ordinary limits of nature gave rise to the story that after his death his heart was found to be covered with hair.¹

Five of his works have come down to us, and fully justify the high reputation which he enjoyed. For although, as might be expected from the juvenility of their author, they are deficient in a wide range of reading and in the results of practical experience, they exhibit a soundness of judgment, a refinement of taste, and a simple elegance of exposition, which belong to the highest order of natural abilities, and place Hermogenes in the first rank of Greek writers on rhetoric. The following are the titles of his extant writings:—

(1.) ‘On general issues,’ (τέχνη ῥητορικὴ περὶ στάσεων). This work was composed when the author was only eighteen, and was probably little more than a methodical exposition of the rules laid down by Hermagoras of Temnos, in the time of Cicero. We have already spoken of the questions involved in such a discussion.² Hermogenes is particularly minute in his subdivisions (διαίρέσεις).³ If the question is uncertain, (a) we have the *status conjecturalis* (στοχασμός); if certain, (b) we have the *status qualitatís* (ποιότης) (b 1), when it is complete, but the *status finitivus* (ὁρικὴ στάσις) (b 2), when it is incomplete; if an exception arises, we have the *status translátivus* (μετάληψις, παραγραφή) (c); and this again is either dependent on documents (ἔγγραφος) (c 1), or not (ἄγραφος) (c 2). Then the qualitative *status* may be about facts, when it is *status rationalis*, (λογικὴ) (b 1, a), or about laws &c., when it is *status legitimus* (νομικὴ) (b 1 β). And the rational is *negotial* (πραγματικὴ) (b 1 a 1), when it refers to the future, but *juridical* (δικαι-

¹ Suidas: λέγεται δὲ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τῶν ὄντι τελευτήσαντος αὐτοῦ ἀνευρεθῆναι, καὶ εὐρέθῃ ἢ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ τετριχωμένη καὶ τῷ μεγέθει πολὺ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως ὑπερβάλλουσα.

² Above, chapter XLVIII. § 4.

³ The book is represented in a tabular analysis by Westermann, *Gesch. der Beredsamk.*, p. 325.

ολογία) (*b* 1, *a* 2) when it refers to the past; and the legitimate is *sylogistic* (*b* 1, β 1), when it refers to one law, but *antino-*
mian (*b* 1, β 2), when it refers to an opposition of two or more
 laws. And so on till we come down to *compensation*, *ambiguity*,¹
 as a form of *antinomy*, and to *recrimination*, *shifting the charge* or
responsibility, and *deprecation*, as subdivisions of the *status*
juridicialis.² We have still commentaries on this treatise by
 Syrianus, Sosipater, and Marcellinus.

(2.) 'On invention' (περὶ εὐρέσεως), in four books. This
 treatise discusses the orderly arrangement of a speech and the
 management of topics, with appropriate examples from the great
 Attic orators. On this work also we have still a commentary
 by some unknown rhetorician.

(3.) 'On the forms of oratory' (περὶ ἰδεῶν), in two books.
 He adduces seven forms: plainness (σαφήνεια), grandeur (μέγε-
 θος), beauty (κάλλος), animation (γοργότης), moral sense (ἥθος),
 truth (ἀλήθεια), power (δεινότης). These he divides into their
 subdivisions, and considers them in reference to the eight par-
 ticulars of conception (ἐννοια), method (μέθοδος), diction (λέξις),
 form (σχῆμα), the separate clause (κῶλον), periodical structure
 (συνθήκη), the pause (ἀνάπαυσις), rhythm (ῥυθμός). The treatise
 closes with critical remarks on some of the best prose writers,
 referring especially to a discussion on the political and pane-
 gyric forms of discourse. This work is still furnished with
 commentaries by Syrianus and Joannes Siceliotes.

(4.) 'On the method of powerful speaking' (περὶ μεθόδου
 δεινότητος). This is a sort of supplement to the last work,
 dwelling particularly on the ordinary figures of speech, and the
 most familiar tricks of rhetoric. We have a commentary on it
 by Gregory of Corinth.

(5.) 'Preparatory exercises' (προγυμνάσματα). This work

¹ ἀμφιβολία περὶ ῥητοῦ ἐκ προσώδιας ἢ διαστάσεως συλλαβῶν γενομένη ἀμφι-
 σβήτησις.

² The δικαιολογία is either assumptive or absolute: in the former we have
 ἀντίστασις or *compensation*, when we take it on ourselves, but ἀντέγκλημα, or
recrimination, when we retort on the plaintiff, μετὰστασις, or *translatio criminis*,
 when the charge is shifted to some person or thing capable of assuming the
 responsibility (εἰς ὑπεύθυνόν τι δυνάμενον γενέσθαι πρᾶγμα ἢ πρόσωπον), and συγ-
 γνώμη, or *deprecatio*, when it is shifted to that which is irresponsible (εἰς οὐ
 δυνάμενον ὑπεύθυνον γενέσθαι, ἀνεύθυνον δὲ πάντη).

was superseded at an early period by an abridgment bearing the name of Aphthonius, and was represented only by Priscian's Latin translation (*Præexercitamenta Rhetorica ex Hermogene*); but the Greek original was discovered at Turin, and published at the end of the last century.¹ It is a practical introduction to the study of rhetoric, with express reference to certain models for imitation.

Besides these works the following are mentioned by Suidas and the scholiasts on Hermogenes: a treatise in two books on Cœle-Syria;² a commentary on Demosthenes, from which Hermogenes himself cites some remarks on the speech against Leptines;³ and a tract on the proem of an oration.⁴

The celebrated sophist HADRIAN of Tyre wrote works apparently of the same class with those of Hermogenes on the forms of oratory and on general issues,⁵ and as it is also mentioned that he wrote 'epistles' and 'Phalaris,'⁶ it has been supposed that he was the author of the imaginary letters, which enabled Bentley to lay the first foundations of historical criticism.⁷

§ 7. The importance which was attached to this vigorous cultivation of rhetoric in the second century, is shown by the fact that an eminent sophist in the succeeding age found himself called upon to compose a work on the biographies of his predecessors. There were three rhetoricians of the name of PHILOSTRATUS.⁸ I. FLAVIUS PHILOSTRATUS, son of Verus, whom Suidas erroneously places in the reign of Nero,⁹ but who

¹ The Greek was first published by A. H. L. Heeren, in the *Bibliothek der alten Literatur und Kunst*, Göttingen, 1791. Both texts appear face to face in Krehl's *Priscian*, vol. II. pp. 422 sqq.

² Suidas, *περί κοίλης Συρίας β'*.

³ Syrian, *ad Hermog.* apud Spengel, p. 195: *εἰς Δημοσθένην ὑπομνήματα*. See Hermogen. *περί μεθόδ. δεινότητος*, 24. p. 430, Walz.: *ὥσπερ Δημοσθένης ἐποίησεν ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς ἀτελείας—ὡς δὲ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τούτου λόγοις διεξήλθομεν*.

⁴ Schol. in *Hermog.* IV. p. 31. Walz.: *ἐν τοῖς περὶ προομίῳ*.

⁵ Suidas, s.v.: *Ἀδριανός, σοφιστής*· ἔγραψε—*περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου ἐν βιβλίοις πέντε, περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς στάσεσιν ἰδιωμάτων ἐν βιβλίοις τρισίν*.

⁶ Suidas, *ibid.*: *ἐπιστολὰς καὶ λόγους ἐπιδεικτικούς, Φάλαριν*.

⁷ Valckenaer, *Præfat. ad Phalarid. Epist.* p. V. ed. 1777.

⁸ Westermann's excellent article in Pauly, V. pp. 1530 sqq., exhausts the subject.

⁹ That this must be an error is plain, for this Philostratus was, according to Suidas himself, *πατὴρ τοῦ δευτέρου Φιλοστράτου*, who, according to him, flourished

really flourished at Athens in the latter half of the second century. He wrote a great number of rhetorical works and declamations, and was the author of forty-three tragedies and fourteen comedies.¹ II. FLAVIUS PHILOSTRATUS, the son of the person just mentioned, was educated by Proclus, and by his father's rival Antipater of Hierapolis.² He first practised as a sophist at Athens, whence he is called 'the Athenian,'³ though he is sometimes confused with the third of the name, and takes the title of Lemnian⁴ proper to that younger rhetorician. This Philostratus, by far the most eminent of the three, was established at Rome in the reign of Septimius Severus, and was alive in the reign of Philippus in the middle of the third century. The empress Julia Domna, the wife of Severus, took him under her special protection, and it was at her request that he wrote the life of the miracle-worker Apollonius of Tyana.⁵ He accompanied Caracalla to Gaul,⁶ and speaks of other journeys which he undertook.⁷ He must have died at a very advanced age, for he lived to commemorate the renown of his grandson.⁸ III. FLAVIUS PHILOSTRATUS, the Lemnian, was the son of Nervianus and a daughter of the second Philostratus,⁹ in whose steps he professedly followed.¹⁰ He died in the reign of Galli-

ἐπὶ Σεβήρου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἕως Φιλίππου, and the lexicographer tells us (s.v. Φρόντων) that Fronto, who lived in the time of Severus, ἀντεπαίδευσε Φιλοστράτῳ τῷ πρώτῳ. He was perhaps placed in the reign of Nero on account of his book called Νέρων (Suid.), which Kayser, the most recent editor of the *Philostrati*, recognizes in the tract attributed to Lucian.

¹ Suidas. Among his works the lexicographer mentions one called γυμναστικός, of which a fragment was discovered by Kayser in 1840, and which has since been found complete in a monastery on Mount Athos by M. Mynas.

² *Vit. Soph.* II. 21. 1, p. 602. 24. 1, p. 607.

³ Euseb. *adv. Hieroclem.* p. 430, Olear.

⁴ Eunap. *Proem.*; Synes. *Dio.* p. 35; *de Insomn.* p. 155.

⁵ *Vit. Apoll.* I. 3, p. 5; *Vit. Soph.* II. 30. 1, p. 622.

⁶ *Vit. Soph.* II. 32. 2, p. 626.

⁷ As to Antioch, *Vit. Soph.* p. 479; cf. *Vit. Apoll.* VIII. 31.

⁸ He mentions (*Vit. Soph.* p. 623) that his grandson, when twenty-four years old, obtained an immunity from public duties (λειτουργιών ἀτέλεια), and refers to the young man's rivalry with Aspasius (p. 627).

He calls the second Philostratus his μητροπάτωρ (p. 861). Suidas says he was ἀδελφόπαις, i.e. nephew, and γαμβρός, i.e. son-in-law, of no. II.

¹⁰ In the preface to his *Images*, he says that he wishes to follow in the steps (κατ' ἔχνη χωρήσαι) of his grandfather's work.

enus A.D. 264.¹ He was engaged in rivalry with Aspasius of Ravenna, who was at the head of the rhetorical school in Rome, and, perhaps in consequence of this, retired to Lemnos, where he died.

The works of the second Philostratus are as follows:—(a) ‘A life of Apollonius of Tyana,’² which has attracted a great deal of attention from the supposed wish of the biographer to set up a rival to the Author of Christianity. The resemblances, which have been noticed between the miraculous history of Apollonius and that recorded in the gospels, are probably due to the Oriental writer Damis of Nineveh, from whom Philostratus derived most of his materials,³ and who may have been acquainted with the writings of the early Christians. That the imperial court at Rome may have wished to bring discredit on the growing religion, or to set up a rival in the superstitions of Paganism, is not at all improbable. It seems, however, that the business of Philostratus was not to invent incidents, but to dress up the narrative of Damis in graces of style, in which it was conspicuously deficient, and so to pave the way for a more general reception of the story among the cultivated classes in Italy and Greece.⁴ At a later period, Hierocles used this life of Apollonius for the purpose of opposing the exclusive claims of Christianity, and was answered by Eusebius.⁵

(b) ‘Images’ (Εἰκόνες) in two books: a sort of descriptive catalogue of a gallery of pictures at Naples, written in a very

¹ Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamk.* § 96, note 12.

² τὰ εἰς Τυανέα Ἀπολλώνιον. Some scholia on this treatise, with notes on the writer by himself and Creuzer, were published by G. J. Bekker, *Specimen Var. Lect. et Observ. in Phil. Vit. Apoll.*, Heidelberg, 1818.

³ *Vit. Apoll.* I. 3, p. 5, sq.

⁴ See the paper on ‘the later ages of heathen philosophy,’ attributed to Professor Malden, in *Knight's Quarterly Mag.* II. p. 178, and Kayser's preface to his edition, pp. IV. VI.

⁵ See the collections of Olearius in his edition of the *Philostrati*, pp. 411 sqq., where he has reprinted the tract of Eusebius with the necessary prolegomena. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, the notorious Charles Blount, to use the words of Lord Macaulay (*Hist. of Engl.* IV. p. 352), ‘translated from the Latin translation part of the life of Apollonius of Tyana, and appended to it notes, of which the flippant profaneness called forth the severe censure of an unbeliever of a very different order, the illustrious Bayle.’

animated and pleasing style, and occasionally throwing considerable light on the allusions in the ancient poets.

(c) 'Heroics' (*Ἡρωϊκά* or *Ἡρωϊκός*),¹ a series of sketches of the heroes of the Trojan war, in the form of a dialogue between a Phœnician voyager and the owner of a vineyard at Eleus in Thrace. This book, like 'the Images,' seems to have been suggested by pictures of the events described, or portraits of the heroes themselves. At all events, it is full of references to pictorial representations either seen or imagined by the writer.²

(d) 'The lives of the Sophists,' containing, in two books, a great number of short sketches of those, whether philosophers or rhetoricians, who had commonly borne this name, from the days of Protagoras and Gorgias down to Aspasius of Ravenna, and other contemporaries of the writer. The first book contains biographies of twenty-six sophists who made pretensions to philosophy; the second, those of thirty-three eminent rhetoricians. It has been proposed³ to divide the work into three books, assigning to the first only eight lives, from Eudoxus of Cnidus to Favorinus of Arles, who may be considered as having been more specially given to the pursuit of philosophy which investigates, than to that of rhetoric which embellishes; the second book, containing eighteen lives, brings the sophists more properly so called down to the same epoch as the sophistical philosophers: it extends from Gorgias to Polemo and Secundus;⁴ the third book, according to this division, corresponds to what is usually regarded as the second book, and extends from

¹ The latter is the more correct form, and is given by Suidas, Menander (Walz, *Rhet.* IX. p. 249) and the oldest MS. of Philostratus.

² It is supposed to have been written A.D. 211-217, to please Caracalla, whose favourite hero was Achilles, the main figure in these pictures (pp. 729-752). The other chief personage is Palamedes (p. 708 sqq.), of whom Boissonade says in the preface to his elaborate edition of this work (Paris, 1806, p. IV): 'Philostratus magnum Palamedem, heroem sophistarum scholasticis declamationibus nobilem, ut perfectæ virtutis exemplar, sibi sumpsit celebrandum.'

³ By Olearius, p. 474.

⁴ Synesius (*Dio*, quoted by Olearius) recognizes this subdivision; he says: *Φιλόστρατος μὲν ὁ Λήμνιος ἀναγράφων τοὺς βίους τῶν μέχρι αὐτοῦ σοφιστῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου δύο μερίδας ποιεῖ, τῶν τε αὐτὸ τοῦτο σοφιστῶν, καὶ τῶν ὅσοι φιλοσοφῆσαντες διὰ τὴν εὐστομίαν ὑπὸ τῆς φήμης εἰς τοὺς σοφιστὰς ἀπηνέχθησαν.*

Herodes Atticus to the contemporaries of Philostratus, Heliodorus the Arab and Aspasius of Ravenna. This work, though disfigured by the usual faults of rhetorical compositions, is of great value to us on many accounts. Indeed, it is our chief and indispensable authority for the peculiar condition of Greek literature so far as it was represented by the rhetoricians in the second century.

(e) Seventy-three epistles, chiefly erotic prolusions. The object was no doubt to exhibit the writer's talents in this field, perhaps with some tacit reference to the similar application of rhetoric in Plato's *Phædrus*. It has been supposed that there were two editions,¹ one published in the author's younger days, and the other a production of his maturer age; but there are no valid grounds for this conjecture.

The only extant work of the younger Philostratus is a book called 'Images,' written in express imitation of that by his grandfather. It has been suggested² that it is a fabrication by some later sophist, who wished to avail himself of the name of Philostratus; if so, and if Suidas is to be preferred to the author of the proemium, the forger was so little acquainted with the relationship between the greatest writer of this name and the last, that he claimed the uncle as the maternal grandfather of the nephew. In the absence, however, of all direct evidence, it would be very rash to prefer a statement in Suidas to the express declaration of a writer in the preface to his own work. Besides, it is not likely that a forger would profess imitation only. He would rather imitate with a view to the reception of his work as an independent effort. Several rhetorical works are attributed to Philostratus the younger,³ but they have not come down to us. And Suidas tells us that some attributed to him the lives of the Sophists.⁴

¹ By Kayser, in his edition.

² By a writer in Smith's *Dictionary*, III. p. 328.

³ Besides the *εἰκόνες*, he wrote *Παναθηναϊκός*, *Τρωϊκός* (perhaps an imitation of the *Ἑρωϊκὰ*), *παράφρασις τῆς Ὀμήρου Ἀσπίδος*, *Μελέται* &c.

⁴ It is in some sort a testimony to the value and interest of the writings attri-

§ 8. Grammarians, who were either rhetoricians also or had much in common with the Sophists, abounded during the period which we have been considering. The following are well known by their works.

JULIUS POLLUX of Naucratis was an eminent sophist and grammarian in the latter half of the second century. He was preceptor to Commodus, who placed him at the head of the rhetorical school at Athens. Of his numerous works only one is extant. It is entitled the *Onomasticon* (ὀνομαστικόν), is divided into ten books, and contains collections of words arranged, not in alphabetical order, but according to their subjects; so that it corresponds to the *Amera-Cosha* of the Indian grammarians, except that it is not metrical. In the absence of the books from which it was compiled, this *Onomasticon* is of the greatest value to the philologist and antiquary.¹

ÆLIUS MÆRIS, who has left us a glossary entitled 'Phrases of the Attic and Hellenic writers' (λέξεις Ἀττικῶν καὶ Ἑλληνῶν), TIMÆUS, the sophist, from whom we have an alphabetical list of 'Platonic phrases' (λέξεις Πλατωνικαί), PHRYNICHUS, an Arabian established in Bithynia, whose 'selection of Attic verbs and nouns' (ἐκλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων), has come down to us complete, and HEPHÆSTION of Alexandria, to whom we owe a 'manual of Greek metres' (ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ μέτρων), have been recommended to scholars and students by the admirable commentaries, of which they have been made the vehicles.² They all flourished in the latter half of the second or in the beginning of the third century.

APOLLONIUS, surnamed Dyscolus, or 'the difficult,' who flourished at Alexandria about the middle of the second century, was the first who reduced Greek grammar to something like a systematic form, and his essays 'on Syntax' and 'on the Pro-

buted to the Philostrati, that Bentley planned and commenced the edition which was afterwards completed with less critical ability by Olearius (Monk's *Life of Bentley*, I. 57). These authors have also engaged the attention of Jacobs, Welcker, Hamaker, Boissonade, and other eminent scholars of the present century.

¹ See, for example, the important emendation of Thucydides, IV. 121, which Cobet, *Var. Lect.* 32, has extracted from Jul. Pollux, III. 152.

² By Pierson, Ruhnken, Lobeck, and Gaisford.

noun' are still of considerable value. His son HERODIANUS, who was established at Rome by the favour of M. Aurelius, wrote a great number of works on grammatical and orthographical subjects. We have still his treatise 'on monosyllables' (περὶ μονήθους λέξεως),¹ and fragments or epitomes of some of his other works.

¹ Published in Dindorf's *Grammatici Græci*, Leps. 1823.

CHAPTER LIII.

ORIENTAL TENDENCIES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY.—NEO-PLATONISM.

§ 1. Growth of oriental ideas among the Greeks. § 2. Philo the Jew. § 3. Plutarch. § 4. Numenius and Cronius. § 5. Ammonius Saccas and Hermes Trismegistus. § 6. Plotinus. § 7. Amelius, Porphyrius, and Iamblichus.

§ 1. **T**HE conquests of Alexander, and the establishment of the Greek language and literature in many countries of the East, produced their inevitable consequences in the growth and development of oriental ideas in the various Greek settlements. While, on the one hand, men of eastern origin, who studied the classical writings of the older Greeks, and composed works in imitation of them, would naturally import into their compositions the doctrines and theories, which they had learned in their youth, and would endeavour to combine their inherited opinions with the wider and more general views, to which their new studies had given them access; on the other hand, the Greek philosophers, who, whether as tourists or as settlers in the East, had acquired a knowledge of the ancient religions and speculative systems of Persians, Jews, or Indians, would feel at least an equal inducement to adopt the suggestions which they recognized as true, and which awakened a new echo in their convictions, or seemed to give greater distinctness to thoughts, which had already occurred to their minds in some dim and indistinct outline.¹ Whatever opinion we may be disposed to entertain of the oriental experiences of the founders of Greek Philosophy, whatever advantages Pythagoras and Plato may have derived from direct intercourse with Eastern sages, or from a study, at first or second hand, of Egyptian and Asiatic

¹ It is maintained by Edward Röth (in his elaborate *Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie*, Mannheim, 1846) that 'the older Greek speculation arose from the Egyptian, with an admixture of Zoroastrian elements, and that in this olden time, up to Plato and including him, the Egyptian circle of ideas formed the basis of the systems formed by most of the Greek thinkers' (pp. 459, 460).

philosophy, we must admit the probability, or rather the necessity, of many coincidences in the leading principles and general results of Hellenic and Eastern speculation. Indo-Germanic ethnography shows us that the nations which produced Plato and Zoroaster are traceable to a common origin.¹ The voice of early history speaks of Phœnician enterprises which made known to Greece the inventions and the religious belief of Semitic tribes.² Comparative mythology points out to us identities of worship and even of theological nomenclature between the inhabitants of Greece and India.³ And, independently of all ethnical or special affinities, we must remember that human nature is radically one and the same, that the human mind is regulated by the same laws and subordinated to the same conditions of thought, and that in all ages there is a harmony between its assumptions and inferences. We are not concerned, however, with these deep-set and universal identities. Our business is to point out those more obvious and superficial relations, which spring from the intercourse of civilized men with one another, and which, when they exhibit themselves in literature, are as much proofs of a direct commerce between different nations, as the foreign goods, which are exposed for sale in the shops of a seaport town. Such an exhibition of imported novelties we find in the philosophy which ultimately defined itself as Neo-Platonism.

We have already mentioned the cultivation of foreign literature at Alexandria, and the translations which were made, chiefly under the auspices of the Ptolemies, from the national histories of the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Jews.⁴ Those, whose knowledge of Greek enabled them to communicate these treasures to the Hellenic world, used the same knowledge as a key to the literature of Greece itself. About the time when the Greek translation of the Hebrew books was finished, the Jews

¹ It is remarkable that one of the first steps in comparative philology was induced by an observation of the resemblance between High German, Persian, and Greek (see *New Cratylus*, § 33, and for the facts see §§ 90-92).

² *Ibid.* §§ 94, 95.

³ See Dr. Max Müller's elaborate paper 'On Comparative Mythology,' in the *Oxford Essays* for 1856.

⁴ See above, chapter XLVI, § 5.

living at Alexandria had begun to write original books in Greek ; and many of these, although they are not accepted by the Jews as a part of their canon, are appended to the Septuagint version, under the common name of *Apocrypha*.¹ Two of the most important of these Hellenistic works are a treatise in fifty-one chapters, called *Ecclesiasticus*, and said to be written by Jesus the son of Sirach;² and an essay in nineteen chapters, called 'the Wisdom of Solomon,'³ and not attributed to any known writer. The first of these is eminently Hebrew, and was a translation from some work, or some three works, written in Hebrew or Aramæan.⁴ But the 'Wisdom of Solomon' is the first-fruit of an intelligent Jew's acquaintance with the philosophy of Plato, and was no doubt written with the intention of showing that Jewish and Hebrew morality had many points of agreement. The essay is divided into two parts. The first, containing chapters I.—X., is devoted to the praises of wisdom. The remaining nine chapters dwell on the peculiar destiny of the Israelites, on their dealings with Egypt, and on the sinfulness of idolatry. In the first part, the author mixes up the traditions of educated Judaism with the doctrines of Plato,⁵ and shows a general acquaintance with the studies of the Museum at Alexandria.⁶ The writer of the second part, which does not

¹ The word ἀποκρυφος, which properly denotes 'secret' or 'recondite,' came to signify in the later Greek that which is kept private or not publicly used and acknowledged (Origen, *Ep. ad Afric.* I. 26). By a further transition of meaning it was applied to the private writings of the heretics; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 357, Potter: βίβλους ἀποκρύφους τῶνδρὸς τοῦδε οἱ τὴν Προδίκου μετῴντες αἴρεσιν αὐχοῦσι κεκτῆσθαι. And finally it denoted whatever was not genuine or canonical; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* III. p. 524, Potter: ἐβρύη δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ δόγμα ἔκ τινος ἀποκρύφου.

² The proper title is: σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σεράχ. The Latin title, *Ecclesiasticus*, implies merely that it was used as a book for proper lessons in the churches.

³ Σοφία Σαλωμών.

⁴ It is expressly stated in the πρόλογος that the work which we have is a translation, and it is inferred that the original was published about B.C. 180, and the version about B.C. 130. De Wette, *Einleitung*, § 316.

⁵ The eighth chapter is specially indicative of the author's acquaintance with Plato; in ver. 7 we have the four cardinal virtues which play such a prominent part in the Platonic philosophy: εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί· σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν, ὧν χρησιμώτερον οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐν βίῳ ἀνθρώποις. And in vv. 19, 20 (παῖς δὲ ἤμην εὐφυής, ψυχῆς τε ἐλαχον ἀγαθῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὧν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον) we have the doctrine of the *Phædo*, p. 82 A, B.

⁶ We have the boasting of an Alexandrian scholar in VII. vv. 13 sqq.

present us with Solomon or his wisdom, is a Jew, who turns the light of his heathen acquirements on the old traditions of his countrymen, and in drawing a contrast between them and the Egyptians at the time of the *Exodus*, does not hesitate to interpret the Pentateuch allegorically,¹ and to connect Jewish usages with alien superstitions.² Some writers have endeavoured to support the hypothesis that this treatise was the work of the celebrated Philo.³ Although we have no hesitation in rejecting this theory,⁴ we recognize in the essay the earliest known example of that combination of Greek and Oriental philosophy, which was most elaborately manifested, probably a hundred years afterwards, by that Alexandrian Jew.⁵

It was not only with the Jewish monotheism that the polytheistic philosophy of the Greeks came in contact. The conquests of Alexander had opened a way to their acquaintance with the gymnosophism of the Indians, which may have produced some influence on the Pyrrhonians and Stoics. And in high Asia was found the full development of a dualism, which had been carried into all the regions of Asia, where the Persians and Medes had been dominant. The Jews had not escaped the contamination, and their literature, subsequently to their return to their own country, is full of allusions to a superstitious belief in intermediate agencies which they had adopted in the land of their captivity. But it was not through the Jews that the Greeks were indoctrinated with some of the consequences of dualism. The mixed population of Asia Minor, through which the older Oriental elements of their own mythology had percolated to the Greeks, also formed the medium for the transference of the magic theurgy, which there, more than anywhere

¹ For example, the darkness brought upon the Egyptians is represented as describing allegorically the terrors of a guilty conscience (XVII. 11 sqq.).

² Thus the ephod (*Exod.* XXVIII. 6, 9, 36) is interpreted according to Egyptian hierology (XVIII. 24, 25).

³ This view is older than Jerome, *Præf. in libros Salom.*: 'nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Philonis Judæi affirmant.'

⁴ The style and the doctrines are quite unlike those of Philo.

⁵ According to E. L. W. Grimm (*Comment. über d. Buch. d. Weisheit.* p. LXIX) the book could not have been written before the reign of Ptolemy Physcon (B.C. 145-117). It was probably contemporary with 'the Wisdom of Jesus Ben-Sirach.'

else, appeared as a result of Medo-Persic dualism.¹ From a belief in two opposed deities, each surrounded by his appropriate host of beneficent or malignant beings, and waging a perpetual war in the human soul and in the outer world,² these nations not unnaturally passed on to the theory which explained all wonderful or unaccountable phenomena by referring them to the intervention of those imaginary beings, who were both the parasites of man's spiritual nature and the invisible engine-drivers of the elements. And if a man, by his superior sanctity and unrivalled asceticism, triumphed over his own lower nature, he was supposed to have gained a corresponding victory over the same agencies as they appear in the outer world, and became a magician, a thaumaturgus, a theurgic worker of miracles.³ This supposition was apparently justified when the self-denying sage, whether by sleight of hand, by mechanical contrivances, by mesmerism, or by the collusion of some of his adherents, appeared to possess supernatural knowledge, or the power of checking or directing the ordinary operations of nature. To what an extent the belief in magical powers and the practice of magical arts had been carried in Asia Minor in the middle of the first century is shown by the circumstance mentioned in the canonical memoirs of the first Christian missionaries, that when the exorcists at Ephesus were converted they burned magical books of the value of 50,000 pieces of silver.⁴ Of all the workers of wonders in Asia Minor the most famous was

¹ It is worthy of remark that, though the Christian writers after the third century endeavoured to maintain the proposition that the Greeks derived their philosophical theories from the East, they supposed by a curious inversion that the Medo-Persic dualism was derived from Pythagoras! Holstenius says (*Dissertatio de vitâ et scriptis Porphyrii*, pp. 8. 9): 'duplex Pythagoreorum συστοιχία, quæ τὰς ἀντικειμένας τῶν ἐνοποιῶν καὶ διακριτικῶν δυνάμεων συζυγίας complectitur, duo illa contraria Manichæorum principia haud dubie nobis peperit: quos alia multa a Pythagorâ mutuatos esse unius Epiphaniî lectione satis superque constat.'

² The author has fully discussed this superstition in a treatise on *Christian Orthodoxy*, Lond. 1857, pp. 128 sqq., 349 sqq.

³ This belief was almost universal in the East. The most extravagant development is perhaps the attainment of more than divine power by Visvâmitra after his perseverance for 1000 years in profound silence and religious observances: see *Râmâyana*, lib. I. c. LXV., Schlegel, especially *çlôkas* 10, 11, and compare the statement about Apollonius of Tyana: ἐσιώπησε κατὰ Πυθαγόραν πέντε ἔτη (Suid.).

⁴ *Acts of the Apostles*, XIX. 19.

APOLLONIUS of Tyana in Cappadocia, to whom we have made more than one reference, and he completed the work which Osthanes had commenced,¹ when, in the time of Xerxes, he introduced into Greece, and especially into Thessaly,² the Median magic, in which he had been brought up. Apollonius was born in the reign of Augustus, and lived to the time of Domitian.³ He studied first in the Greek schools at Tarsus, and was led to the adoption of the Pythagorean philosophy. This he combined with the legerdemain practised in some of the Asclepeia,⁴ and a journey to the old seats of magic in Babylonia and Persia, and to the confines of India,⁵ initiated him into the theurgic practices of the East. With great skill and good fortune he worked on the credulity of his admirers; and when the Syrian priestess, Julia Domna, was seated by Severus on the throne of the Cæsars, and made Oriental magic fashionable at Rome, the great sophist of the day, Philostratus, was induced, as we have seen, to collect the marvellous traditions respecting his life, and to publish them in a form calculated to ensure their circulation. A natural concomitant of this power of working wonders was the gift of prophecy, not unconnected with astrology, to which many of these votaries of Eastern superstition laid claim. And here, too, the Pythagoreans took a leading part. Their study of mathematics, especially their perpetual play with the occult properties of numbers,

¹ Pliny, *H. N.* XXX. 1, § 8: 'primus, quod exstet, ut equidem invenio, commentatus est de eâ Osthanes Xerxen regem Persarum bello quod is Græciæ intulit comitatus, ac velut semina artis portentosæ insparsit obiter infecto quacunq̃ue commeaverant mundo.'

² It was in Thessaly that the Persians established themselves most firmly during their invasion of Greece, and here magic prevailed especially, from the days of Aristophanes (*Nub.* 749) down to those of Horace (*Epod.* V. 45, VII. 4. 87), Tibullus (*l.* 2. 45), Lucan (*VI.* 499), and Appuleius (*Met.* III). It is not impossible that the early connexion of the Thessalian navigators with Pontus, as shown in the story of *Medea*, whose name has a suspicious affinity to that of the magic land, may have laid the first foundations of this trade in superstition.

³ Saxe (*Onomast.* I. p. 247) places his birth at A.D. 50.

⁴ It appears that he was a useful coadjutor of the priest-physician: see *e.g.* Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* I. p. 10 sqq.

⁵ On the casting out of unclean spirits, which Apollonius found among the Brahmins, see Philostratus, *Vit.* III. 38, p. 128. He considered the countrymen of Visvâmitra the truest philosophers, and preferred them to the Egyptians; VI. 2. p. 244.

engaged them in complicated and fanciful calculations,¹ and, when these led to lucky guesses respecting the future, the coincidences were received as proofs of their supernatural knowledge, and their many mistakes were forgotten. Most of the Roman emperors were under the influence of some of these superstitions, which are so far interesting to us as showing the widespread influence of Oriental ideas, and accounting for some of the literary phenomena which we are about to describe. The two causes of heresy among the Christians of the first four centuries represent also the two sources of corruption which deteriorated the philosophy of Greece. As Gnosticism originated in the Orientalized Platonism of the Alexandrians, and Manichæism in the combination of Persian dualism with the ascetic theurgy of the Pythagoreans,² so we find that the Greek philosophers themselves inclined to one or other of these tendencies, and Neo-Platonists or Neo-Pythagoreans became the only influential sects in the last days of heathenism, both of them provoking the contemptuous opposition of the few, who, rejecting foreign superstitions and speculative transcendentalism, sought to rule the polytheistic world by sound morality and practical common sense.

§ 2. It is said³ that as early as the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, about 170 B.C., a Jew, named ARISTOBULUS, had made an attempt formally to identify the system of the Jewish law with the results of the teaching of Greek poets and philosophers, especially with Peripateticism.⁴ His object was to show that the latter had borrowed from the former, and he did not hesi-

¹ A good example of this is furnished by the fact which Tacitus mentions in speaking of the interval between the two conflagrations of Rome (*Annal.* XV. 41): 'alii eo usque cura progressi sunt ut totidem annos mensesque et dies inter utraque incendia numerent,' that is (as Grotefend has shown, *Rhein. Mus.* 1845, p. 152) they ascertained that the interval of 454 years amounted to 418 years + 418 months + 418 days, and of course interpreted this as a fatality.

² See Röth, u.s. p. 460; *Chr. Orthod.* pp. 139, 140.

³ *Chron. Pusch.* p. 143 [178, Par.]: 'Αριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο, ὅς Πτολεμαῖω τῷ Φιλομήτορι ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωύσεως γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν.

⁴ There is a well known essay by L. C. Valckenaer on this subject: *Diatribē de Aristobulo, Alexandrino Judæo, Scriptore Commentarii in legem Moysis*, Ludg. Pat. 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelicæ*, Oxon. 1843, Vol. IV. pp. 339 sqq.

tate to support his opinions by evident forgeries.¹ This writer is referred to by Clement of Alexandria,² Origen,³ and Eusebius,⁴ but it is now a general opinion that the work, ascribed to him, was written by a Jew of much later date than the Aristobulus of Philometor's time.⁵ At any rate his book is lost.⁶ The reconciliation, however, of Jewish and Gentile teaching was undertaken in the first century of our æra by an Alexandrian Jew, who brought to the work a remarkable combination of Greek and Hebrew learning, and whose works, or a large portion of them, are still extant. PHILO, commonly called JUDÆUS, to distinguish him from other Greek writers of the same name, was a member of a priestly family, and was born at Alexandria about B.C. 20.⁷ Belonging to the sect of the Pharisees, he had acquired all the learning which was necessary to ensure his reputation among his own countrymen, and was placed at the head of an embassy, consisting of five Jews, who proceeded to Rome, about A.D. 40, to plead with Caligula for the uninterrupted exercise of their religion.⁸ This embassy produced no results, for the emperor would not admit the deputation to an audience with him.⁹ But his death in the following year put a stop to the persecution, and Philo was able to write an account of his mission without any further consequences to himself or his race. The only other circumstance in the life of

¹ Valckenaer, u.s. §§ IV. V. &c.

² *Strom.* I. p. 360, Potter, V. p. 705, Potter.

³ *C. Cels.* IV. p. 198: περὶ τῶν Φίλωνος συγγραμμάτων, ἥ καὶ τῶν ἐν ἀρχαιοτέροις, ὑποῖά ἐστι τὰ Ἀριστοβούλου.

⁴ *Præp. Evang.* VII. 15, VIII. 8, 9, 10, XIII. 12.

⁵ This opinion was first started by Hody, *De Bibl. Textu Originali*, 1705, lib. I. 9, whom Valckenaer undertakes to answer: u.s. § VIII. It was Hody's opinion that the writer in question flourished in the second century A.D.

⁶ About eight pages (Valcken. u.s. § VII. p. 22 [361, Gaisf.]) are transcribed by Eusebius, whose *Præparatio Evangelica* asserts the same pious paradox; see below, chapter LVIII. § 4.

⁷ *De Legat. ad Gaium.* II. p. 567, Mangey; Joseph. *Ant.* XVIII. 8, § 1, XX. 5, § 2, XIX. 5, § 1; Euseb. *H. E.* II. 4, p. 106, Heinichen; Hieron. *Catal. Script. Eccles.*; Gfrörer, *Philo u. die Alex. Theosophie*, I. p. 38.

⁸ *De Congressu*, p. 530; *De Legat.* p. 572; Joseph., u.s.

⁹ Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* VIII. 10) gives a fragment of his ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων, which Philo composed as chief of the embassy, and which Caligula refused to hear; see Viger, *ad l.* (Heinichen, p. 396).

Philo, which seems to be certain, is a journey to Jerusalem,¹ which may have been one of several visits paid to the chief of his religion.

The great bulk of the works of Philo consists of a series of commentaries, with separate titles, on the main subjects of the *Pentateuch*. Thus, the commentary on the first chapter of *Genesis* is entitled 'on the cosmogony of Moses' (περὶ τῆς Μωσέως κοσμοποιΐας); that on the second and third chapters is headed 'allegories of the sacred laws after the six days' (νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον); that on the last verse of the third, and the first four verses of the fourth chapter, has the title 'on the Cherubim and the fiery sword, and Cain the firstborn from man' (περὶ τῶν χερουβὶμ καὶ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας καὶ τοῦ κτισθέντος πρώτου ἕξ ἀνθρώπου Κάιν). Then follow as successive commentaries on the fourth chapter—'on the sacrifices of Abel and Cain' (περὶ ὧν ἱερουργουῶσιν Ἀβελ τε καὶ Κάιν); 'on the tendency of the worse to assail the better' (περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεται). And so on, with less minuteness, down to the end of *Deuteronomy*. The want of proportion in these detached commentaries, as well as their completeness in themselves, seems to show that they were not merely parts of a continuous book, but rather separate treatises on texts from the sacred books of the Jews. Philo wrote other books not immediately referring to the *Pentateuch*, such as that 'on the incorruptibility of the world' (περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου); 'that every good man is free' (περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον); 'on the contemplative life or the virtues of suppliants' (περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν); 'a treatise on the Therapeutæ,' an Egyptian branch of the Essenes; 'against Flaccus, the governor of Egypt, and an enemy of the Jews;' 'concerning virtues and the embassy to Caius;' 'concerning nobility.' Besides the works existing in Greek, some have been discovered

¹ He said himself (*De Providentiâ*, apud Euseb. P. E. VIII. 14, p. 416, Heinichen) that he was at Ascalon καθ' ὃν χρόνον εἰς τὸ πατρῶον ἱερὸν ἐστελλόμεν, εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύων. The stories of his interview with Peter at Rome (Euseb. II. E. II. 17, p. 139, Heinichen), of his verses in honour of the disciples of Mark at Alexandria (Suid.), and of his apostasy from Christianity (Phot. Cod. CV), seem to be worthless fables.

in an Armenian version, but the genuineness of all these is not admitted.¹ Among the lost works of Philo are mentioned 'an alphabetical Hebrew lexicon,' which seems to have formed the basis of those used by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and Jerome;² and lives of the patriarchs Isaac and Jacob, which are referred to in the 'life of a statesman—that is, Joseph' (βίος πολιτικοῦ ὅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἰωσήφ).³

The object of Philo in all these works is to harmonize the philosophy of religion, which he had derived from a study of Plato,⁴ Aristotle, and other eminent heathen writers, with the letter of the books attributed to Moses. And he effects this reconciliation by an unlimited licence of allegory.⁵ This mode of dealing with ancient writers is justified not only by the practice of the Pharisees in Palestine, as we infer from the example of St. Paul,⁶ but also by the licence of the Greeks in dealing with their own mythology in general, and with Homer in particular. Besides, he had been directly preceded in this method by Aristæas and Aristobulus; and was succeeded by the Christian Fathers, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Some of his allegories are far-fetched and improbable; others are near approximations to the true and intended meaning of the Hebrew document. An example of the former is his way of dealing with the story of Hagar.⁷ 'Sarah, who represents devotion, gives birth to virtue: Hagar, who indicates learning, gives birth to the sophist. If learning will not serve virtue, what says the Scripture? Cast forth the handmaiden and her son.' An example of a true or nearly true interpretation is furnished by his view of the fall of man.⁸ 'Eve is concupiscence con-

¹ See Dähne, *über die Schriften des Juden Philo. Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, pp. 987 sqq.

² Schöll, *Hist. Lit. Gr.* V. p. 71.

³ Vol. II. p. 41, Mangey; cf. p. 180.

⁴ It used to be a saying, according to Suidas, that: ἡ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει ἡ Φίλων πλατωνίζει.

⁵ He says himself of the Therapeutæ (*De Vitâ Contemplativâ*, II. p. 475): ἐν-
τυγχάνοντες τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι φιλοσοφοῦσι τὴν πατριον φιλοσοφίαν ἀλληγοροῦντες·
ἐπειδὴ σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἐρμηνείας νομίζουσι φύσεως ἀποκεκρυμμένης ἐν
ὑπονοίαις δηλουμένης.

⁶ *Galat.* IV. 21 sqq.

⁷ *De Cherubim*, p. 2—6, apud Creuzer in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 36.

⁸ *Leg. Alleg.* III. p. 106, apud Dähne in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 1006.

nected with the heart of Adam—that is, the mind of man considered as balanced between good and evil. The serpent is sensual pleasure, by means of which concupiscence leads the mind of man to indulgence in gratifications unworthy of his spirit; and in this consists the fall, and its consequence, the birth of Cain—that is, of proud, foolish, and sinful opinions among men.’

The doctrines which Philo established by this procedure as both Greek and Jewish, both philosophically true and divinely revealed, have reference chiefly to the relations between God and the world. He taught that God alone can give a knowledge of truth, which is implanted in the mind of man by a sort of divine intuition.¹ And by a series of gradations he supposed that man could ascend from the lowest perceptions, which are the food of the mind,² to the highest idea, that of God himself.³ But God, according to the conception of Philo, does not present himself immediately to the mind of man. Relatively to this world, he exists and manifests himself in his divine *Logos* or Word, through whom, as an instrument or medium, he created the universe. For of the four things which must concur in an act of creation, the agent, the materials, the instrument, and the cause, the first is God, the second the four elements, the third is the *Logos*, and the fourth the goodness of the Creator.⁴ The *Logos* then becomes manifested Deity, and to it are ascribed the attributes of God, as the maker and governor of the world. These attributes are, goodness, by which He created the world, and power, by which He rules it. And these two are united together by the Word of God.⁵ But the peculiar

¹ *De Confus. Linguarum*, XXV. 424 : καὶ μὴν σφαλλομένων γε τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς περὶ τε νοῦν καὶ αἰσθησιν κριτηρίων, ἀνάγκη τὸ ἀκόλουθον ὁμολογεῖν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς τῷ μὲν τὰς ἐννοίας τῇ δὲ τὰς ἀντιλήψεις ἐπομβρεῖ, καὶ ἐστὶν οὐ τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς μερῶν χάριν τὰ γινώμενα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ δι’ ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς γεγόναμεν δωρεὰι πᾶσαι.

² *De Plant. Noe*. XXXII. 349 : τὸ τρέφον τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν ἐστὶν αἰσθησις.

³ *De Creat. Mundi*, VI. p. 5.

⁴ *De Cherub*. XXXV. p. 161 : ὁ θεὸς αἴτιον οὐκ ὄργανον, τὸ δὲ γινώμενον δι’ ὄργανον μὲν ὑπὸ δὲ αἰτίου πάντως γίνεται. p. 162 : ἴδε τόνδε τὸν κόσμον εὐρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεὸν ὑφ’ οὗ γέγονεν, ὕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα ἐς ὧν συνεκράθη, ὄργανον δὲ Λόγον Θεοῦ δι’ οὗ συνεσκευάσθη, τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ.

⁵ *De Cherub*. IX. p. 143 sqq.; cf. *De Sacrif. Abel*, XV. p. 173; *De Abrah.* XXIV. 19; *De Mut. Nom.* IV. p. 582 (this latter work is a commentary on the

property of God as such is creative activity, which is as necessary to His existence as heat is to fire or cold to snow.¹ This creative activity goes on in a descending series of emanations. For as God is the exemplar or pattern of His image, the *Logos*, so He again is the archetype of other things, including man.² When this activity of creation terminated, active goodness ceased and passive evil commenced;³ and thus Philo arrived at the reciprocal limitations of antagonistic qualities,⁴ which would have amounted to dualism, if he had not been careful to confine all real agency to the sphere of light and goodness.

It is not our business to enter at length into the philosophy of Philo; but we have given these samples to show to what an extent he has influenced the thoughts and phrasology of even the earliest Christian writers.⁵ For himself, he is very tolerant of heathen systems. Even the mythology of the Greeks is touched with a gentle hand; and it has been remarked that he treats the fable of Castor and Pollux in such a manner that one could hardly believe him to be a Jew.⁶ All the principal schools of Greek philosophy were more or less known to him.⁷ Plato is his favourite. But he adopts the views of the Pythagoreans and other philosophers in speaking of the number seven.⁸ He uses familiarly the Aristotelian distinction between the *potential* and the *actual*, and even employs the term *entelechy*.⁹ To the Stoics he makes many references, and

18th of Genesis). For a similar view of Christians, see Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* V. § 155, 5.

¹ *Leg. Alleg.* I. 3, p. 44: παύεται γὰρ οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ Θεός, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἴδιον, τὸ καίειν πυρὸς καὶ χύονος τὸ ψύγειν, οὕτω καὶ Θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν.

² *Ibid.* I. 1: ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς παράδειγμα τῆς εἰκόνος, ἣν σκίαν νυνὶ κέκληκεν, οὕτως ἡ εἰκὼν ἄλλων γίνεται παράδειγμα.

³ *De Confus. Ling.* XXXIV. p. 431; *De Creat. Mundi*, XXIV. p. 17; *De Cherub.* XXIV. p. 153: ἴδιον μὲν δὴ Θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν, ἴδιον δὲ γεννητοῦ τὸ πάσχειν.

⁴ *De incorrupt. Mundi*, XX. p. 507.

⁵ See Professor Jowett's essay on St. Paul and Philo in his edition of the Epistles to Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, and Mr. Churchill Babington's comparison of 1 *Cor.* XV. 44—47, with *Leg. Alleg.* I. 12, 13, in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, I. p. 47.

⁶ Hemsterhuis, quoted by Creuzer, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 33: 'Ita versatur in hac re (in Castoris et Pollucis fabulâ) ut Judæum haud ferne agnoscas.'

⁷ Creuzer, *u.s.* pp. 28 sqq.

⁸ *De Mundi Opificio* I. p. 66, Pfeiffer.

⁹ *Leg. Alleg.* I. p. 64, Mangey, p. 178, Pfeiffer.: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ κηρῷ, δυνάμει μὲν εἰσι πᾶσαι αἱ σφραγίδες, ἐν τελεχείᾳ δὲ μόνον ἡ τετυπωμένη, κ.τ.λ.

blends their dogmas occasionally with those of Plato.¹ And though directly opposed in many points to Epicurus, he very often appropriates his technical terms, and shows a familiarity with his system.² The style of Philo is such as might have been expected from so comprehensive a study of the best prose authors. It is copious, exact, and energetic. In many minor points we detect the Hellenist;³ and a scholar, who has paid special attention to that department of syntax, has observed that Philo is the only Greek prose writer known to him who neglects the idiomatic use of the repeated article with nouns in regimen.⁴ His knowledge of Hebrew was not critical in our sense of the term. Reading the rolls without points, as he necessarily did, he often mistakes the intended combination of syllables.⁵

§ 3. PLUTARCHUS, whose popular biographies, to be noticed in a subsequent chapter, have gained for him the more familiar name of PLUTARCH, stands next to Philo both in age and character as a representative of oriental tendencies in Greek philosophy. He was born at Chæronea in Bœotia, about A.D. 40; for he was still a student of philosophy in A.D. 16, when Nero was in Grecece,⁶ and he calls himself a contemporary of that emperor,⁷ who was born in A.D. 37. His father's name is not known, but it was probably the same as that of his great-grandfather Nicarchus,⁸ just as Plutarch's brother Lamprias was called after his grandfather. Of the circumstances of his life little is known. His chief instructor was Ammonius,⁹ under

¹ See the passages quoted by Creuzer, pp. 30—32, note.

² *Leg. Alleg.* III. pp. 278, 326, Pfeiffer; *De Providentiâ*, I. p. 25, Aucher.

³ See Creuzer, u.s. pp. 21—25.

⁴ Middleton, *On the Greek Article*, p. 37. He adds: 'his style is indeed florid and oratorical, but by no means correct'—an opinion which is not generally valid.

⁵ As when he reads עֵר $\text{הַ$ חָרָסִים סוּ for עֵר $\text{הַ$ עֲוֹנֹת , or when he explains the name עֵר by אֵל מִצִּיט אֶפֶס זֶוֹהֵם תְּשׁוּבָה , *De post. Caini*, p. 238; and he actually founds his explanation of the wickedness of *Er* (*Gen.* XXXVIII. 7) on the confusion of his name עֵר , which signifies 'wakeful,' with עֹר 'leather' (*Leg. Alleg.* III. 23). Sometimes he derives the Hebrew names from the Greek, when he connects the Paradisiacal river פַּרְדִּיסָא with φειδωρ (*Leg. Alleg.* I. 20).

⁶ $\text{περὶ τοῦ ΕΙ ἐν Δελφοῖς}$ I.

⁷ *Vit. Anton.* 87, *ad fin.*: οὗτος ἄρξας ἐφ' ἡμῶν.

⁸ This conjecture, which is sufficiently obvious, is as old as Corsini.

⁹ He calls him $\text{ὁ ἡμέτερος καθηγητής}$, *De disc. amic. ab adulat.* p. 70 E. Cf. *Quæst. Symp.* III. 1, IX. 1.

whom he studied at Athens; and he lived on terms of friendship with Favorinus.¹ While still young he was selected as one of a deputation sent from Chæronea to wait on the proconsul.² And it was probably in the earlier part of his life that he first visited Italy, where he made the acquaintance of L. Junius Arulenus Rusticus, afterwards put to death by Domitian.³ He was again at Rome in the time of Trajan, who, according to Suidas, gave him consular rank, and made him superintendent of Illyria. It was probably about this time that he became intimate with Gaius Sossius Senecio, to whom he dedicated many of his works.⁴ At the beginning of Hadrian's reign he was Procurator of Greece,⁵ and he served as Archon of his native city,⁶ and was priest of the Pythian Apollo.⁷ He seems to have died about A.D. 120.⁸

Plutarch was a most prolific writer. Besides the parallel lives of eminent Greeks and Romans, by which he is best known, and which will be mentioned in a subsequent chapter, he has left us about eighty essays on a great variety of subjects.⁹ These miscellaneous treatises are designated in the editions as the *Moralia*, or moral works of Plutarch; but ten of them belong to his historical or antiquarian labours; and the others are dialogues or disquisitions on topics connected with almost every branch of literature. We find among them controversial pamphlets directed against the Stoics and Epicureans,¹⁰ discussions on the opinions of various philosophers,¹¹ physical,¹² metaphysical,¹³ political,¹⁴ religious,¹⁵ and ethical tracts,¹⁶ rules of

¹ Above, ch. LII. § 4.

² *Præcepta gerendæ reipublicæ*, p. 272, Wyttēb.: μέμνημαι νέον ἐμᾶντὸν ἐτι πρεσβευτὴν μεθ' ἑτέρου πεμφθέντα πρὸς ἀνθύπατον.

³ *De Curiositate*, 15; III. p. 102, Wyttēb.

⁴ The following are inscribed with Senecio's name: *De sentiēdo profectu in virtute*, his *Symposiaca*, and his lives of Theseus and Romulus, of Demosthenes and Cicero, of Dion and Brutus. See Wyttēbach, *Animadv.* VI. 1, p. 554.

⁵ Syncell, p. 349.

⁶ *Quæst. Sympos.* VI. 8.

⁷ *An seni sit Respublica gerenda*, p. 792 E.

⁸ Saxe puts it at this year, which is most probable; according to Corsini (p. XII.), he died in A.D. 134.

⁹ The list in Wyttēbach (pp. CLIV.—CLXXII.) amounts to 86, but about 6 of these are spurious.

¹⁰ See those numbered 74—77 in Wyttēbach's list.

¹¹ See No. 62.

¹² Nos. 63—68.

¹³ No. 76.

¹⁴ Nos. 54—57.

¹⁵ Nos. 45, 46.

¹⁶ Nos. 4—9, 31—44.

health,¹ advice to the newly married,² good sayings of kings,³ Lacedæmonian brevities,⁴ speculations on an inscription at Delphi,⁵ and consolations, one addressed to Apollonius, and one to his own wife on the death of their daughter.⁶ In this collection, some tracts at least, such as that 'on the names of mountains and rivers, and what is found there,'⁷ are not genuine. But all the works which proceeded from Plutarch's pen are distinguished by the qualities which have won so much reputation for his imitator Montaigne. Without much of profound or original thought, he exhibits a great deal of shrewd observation and practical common sense, and his prodigious stores of general knowledge are always brought to bear on the illustration of his subject in a very felicitous manner. His style is laboured, and his sentences are often unskilfully constructed. But there is nothing to censure in his language beyond the general faults of his age.

As a philosopher, Plutarch was, like Philo, a Platonist tinged with orientalism. But he was more decidedly Platonic than the Alexandrian Jew, and not, like him, bound to uphold the documents of a particular form of eastern teaching. With regard to Greek systems, he not only inclines to Plato's views, but directly controverts those of the Stoics and Epicureans; on the other hand, he attaches but little importance to dialectics, which is the key-stone of Platonism,⁸ and holds strongly to a belief in Providence, which was a prominent tenet of the Porch.⁹ With regard to oriental doctrines, Plutarch professes a great reverence for the old worship of his country,¹⁰ to the priesthood of which he ultimately belonged; and he particularly objects to foreign superstitions and to the introduction of Jewish and Syrian rites into Greece.¹¹ But at the same time, he endeavours, like Philo, though from the Greek side, to harmonize the philosophy of religion with what he conceived to be the true interpretation of the worship of Isis and Osiris; and he believed, like

¹ No. 11.² No. 12.³ No. 15.⁴ Nos. 16, 18.⁵ No. 28.⁶ Nos. 10, 49.⁷ Wytténb. p. CLXXII: 'manifesto spurius.'⁸ *De Prof. in Virt.* 7.⁹ *De serâ Numinis vindictâ*, passim.¹⁰ *Amator*, 12; *De serâ Num. vind.* 22.¹¹ *De superst.* 3, 8; *De Stoic. repugn.* 38.

the eastern dualists, in the existence both of a good spirit, who guided the conscience,¹ and of evil dæmons, and he acknowledged a malignant being of superior power.² His attempt to effect a compromise between religion and philosophy was rendered less successful by his want of confidence and clear views with regard to either of them.³ The most remarkable feature of resemblance between him and Philo is his recognition of the distinction between absolute and unmanifested Deity, and the Creating Power, which gives a form to the universe. With him, Isis corresponds to the Word, who connects creation with the supreme and invisible Osiris.⁴ But he does not, like Philo, regard matter as absolutely passive. Holding generally, with his master Plato, to the opposition between the spiritual and the material, he did not regard the latter as being motionless or without a soul.⁵ He could not conceive that motionless and soulless matter could be the cause of evil; but sought this in the disorderly motions naturally belonging to a sort of lower soul. Thus he fell back on the dualism of Zoroaster, and referred the origin of the world to two distinct principles—one inherently good, and the other inherently evil.⁶ With him, as with the Manichæans, the soul of man—the middle man of Philo—was an intermediate nature,⁷ a battle-field between the opposing principles of good and evil; its rational part being derived from God and inclining to good; its irrational part being derived from the principle of evil in the world, and naturally inclining to the disorderly motions which belong to its origin.⁸ The consolation which he suggests, is derived from the belief that these principles are not of equal power, but that the power of good, both in men and in the world, predominates

¹ 'What is Plutarch's cardinal doctrine? That the same word, the Dæmon who spoke to the heart of Socrates, is speaking to him and to every philosopher; 'coming into contact,' he says, 'with him in some wonderful manner; addressing the reason of those who, like Socrates, keep the reason pure, not under the dominion of passion, nor mixing itself greatly with the body, and therefore quick and sensitive in responding to that which encountered it' (Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 96).

² *Is. et Os.* 25, 26, 59; *De def. Orac.* 14, 38; *De gen. Socr.* 20, 33.

³ Ritter, *Hist. of Ancient Phil.* IV. p. 493.

⁴ *Id.* p. 498.

⁵ *Platon. Quæst.* VIII. 8.

⁶ *De defect. Orac.* 47; *De anim. procr.* 6, 27; *Is. et Osir.* 46 sqq.

⁷ *Is. et Osir.* 48; *πληρη τις μεταξὺ φύσις.*

⁸ *Ibid.* 49.

over the power of evil.¹ In general, as Philo uses philosophy to interpret the laws of Moses, so Plutarch appeals to the same authority for the true and rational explanation of the systems of ancient lawgivers, whom he regards as the primitive theologians of the world,² and he subordinates tradition in all respects to speculation.³

§ 4. The oriental tendencies of the Neo-Platonism which we have recognized in Philo and Plutarch, assumed a very definite form in the writings of NUMENIUS, who was a native of Apamea in Syria,⁴ and flourished about the middle of the second century. Although we have only fragments of his numerous writings, the manner in which he is referred to by the Neo-Platonists and Platonizing Christians of the following age, shows that he was regarded as a great authority, and as having contributed more than any one to the reconciliation of Greek philosophy with oriental traditions. His leading principle was the belief that Plato, who formed, as he thought, a sort of connecting bond between Pythagoras and Socrates, really preached in a Greek form the revealed doctrines of the Jewish legislator. And he went so far as to say, 'What is Plato, but Moses talking Attic Greek?'⁵ But he applied his Pythagorean principles also to the identification of Egyptian, Persian, and even Brahminical dogmas.⁶ And without mentioning our Saviour by name, he made the Gospels the subjects of philosophical allegories not unlike those which Philo spun from the Pentateuch.⁷ Although he leant more than Philo or Plutarch on his Oriental authorities, the general complexion of his philosophy does not seem to have differed materially from theirs. According to him the Supreme God is quiescent in the creation, and this in

¹ *Ibid.*: μεμιγμένη γὰρ ἡ τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις καὶ σύστασις ἐξ ἐναντιῶν, οὐ μὴν ἰσοσθενῶν δυνάμεων, ἀλλὰ τῆς βελτιονος τὸ κράτος ἐστίν.

² *De defect. Orac.* 48; *De anim. procr.* 33.

³ *Is. et Osir.* 63.

⁴ His name Νουμήμιος may have been a translation of the Semitic *Ben-Chodesh*, 'son of the month.' At least, this interpretation is given in a Maltese inscription for the name of a man of Citium: Creuzer, *ad Vit. Plotini*, p. XCV.

⁵ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 411, Potter: τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς ἀππικίζων; similarly Suidas, s.v. Νουμήμιος.

⁶ Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* IV. 7, 8.

⁷ Origen *c. Cels.* IV. 51, p. 543, De la Rue.

consequence of his own inherent motion.¹ In order that the world might come into being, it was necessary that He should work by or through a primary emanation, a second God, a Son or *Logos*, who gives beginning and continued life to the world, who imparts the divine reason to man, and combines the eternal spirit with perishable matter.² And thus the second God is divided into two, the one independent of the senses but acting on sensible objects, and the other locked up and included in tangible matter.³ The soul with him, as with Plutarch, was twofold, rational and irrational,⁴ constituting an antagonistic dualism, a perpetual warfare within.⁵ Evil results from the irrational soul which is combined with matter, while the higher soul is good of itself.⁶ Man, then, is an intermediate being between spirit and matter, between good and evil. And if he would ascend to the highest nature of which he is capable, he must triumph over all sensual pleasures, and encourage his abstract reason by mathematical studies, and especially by studying the One.⁷ From these fragmentary notices, it is clear that Numenius occupied a very important and epochal position between the earlier and later Neo-Platonists, and it would not be too much to say that he was the immediate founder of the systems of Christian and heathen philosophy which flourished at Alexandria in the third century. It is expressly stated by Eusebius⁸ that his works were a favourite study with Origen. Clement, we have seen,⁹ was well acquainted with them; and Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus,¹⁰ tells us that Amelius, one of the most distinguished disciples of that philosopher, had copied out and committed to memory most of the writings of Numenius, and that these works were read in the lecture rooms of Plotinus himself.¹¹ CRONIUS, who is always mentioned along

¹ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* XI. 18.

² *Id. ibid.* IX. 22, XI. 18.

³ *Id. ibid.*: ὁ μὲν οὖν πρῶτος περὶ τὰ νοητά, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περὶ τὰ νοητὰ καὶ αἰσθητά. Procl. in *Tim.* II. 95: ὁ γὰρ κόσμος κατ' αὐτὸν (Νουμήμιον) ὁ τρίτος ἐστὶ θεός.

⁴ Porphyr. *ap. Stob. Ecl.* I. 836.

⁵ Iambl. *ib.* 894.

⁶ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* XIII. 5.

⁷ *Id.* XI. 18, 22.

⁸ *Hist. Eccles.* VI. 19, p. 204, Heinichen.

⁹ Above, p. 182, note 5.

¹⁰ p. LIII. Creuzer: σχεδὸν πάντα τὰ Νομημίου γράψαι καὶ συναγαγεῖν καὶ σχεδὸν τὰ πλείστα ἐκμαθεῖν.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. LXIV. Creuzer.

with Numenius, seems to have made the poems of Homer the subjects of mystical and allegorical interpretations of the same kind as those which Numenius and his school applied to the Oriental documents.¹

§ 5. Although it seems clear, even on the admission of the Alexandrian Platonists themselves, that Numenius was the immediate founder of their school, the circumstance that he was not settled in Egypt not unnaturally led to the substitution for him of a later philosopher of the same class who lived and taught at Alexandria. This was AMMONIUS, distinguished from others of the name as *Saccas*, from his original employment as a corn porter (σακκάς=σακκοφόρος). He was born about A.D. 170, and died after A.D. 243.² It is stated by Porphyry that he was born a Christian, and that he apostatized from the true faith. But this is denied by Eusebius and Jerome.³ The probability is that he had embraced the true faith, but that his philosophy ran into such generalities that it lost its specific character in regard to Christian teaching. His chief disciples at any rate were not professors of Christianity. Besides the great Plotinus, he taught Longinus, Herennius, both the Origenes, and Heraclides.⁴ The only Christians among these were the last and Origenes Adamantius. Of the distinctive doctrines of Ammonius we have no means of forming an adequate notion. He not only committed nothing to writing, but, as it seems, regarded his teaching, or the most profound part of it, as a secret, which was not to be divulged to the public. At any rate we find

¹ Porphyry, *De Antro Nymph.* 21. It would almost appear, from what Porphyry says at the beginning of this tract, that it was suggested by a similar essay from the pen of Cronius; he alleges that the gazetteers have found no such cave in Ithaca, ὡς φησι Κρόνιος, and after entering into some particulars, he adds: τοιαῦτα τοίνυν ὁ Κρόνιος προειπὼν φησὶν ἐκδηλον εἶναι οὐ τοῖς σοφοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰδιώταις ἀλληγορεῖν τι καὶ αἰνίττεσθαι διὰ τούτων τὸν ποιητήν.

² Plotinus, who was born in A.D. 205, began to study philosophy in 233, when he was twenty-eight years old, and did not go to Ammonius till he had made trial of the other teachers of Alexandria; he stayed with Ammonius till his thirty-ninth year, i.e. till 244, when he joined the expedition of Gordian: Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, 3, pp. LI. LII. Creuzer.

³ Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 19, pp. 206, 7, Heinichen; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccles.* § 55.

⁴ Ammian. Marcell. XXII. 16, 16: Ruhnken, *Dissert. Philol. de Vita et Scriptis Longini*, § V.; Valesius and Heinichen, *ad Euseb. H. E.* VI. 10, pp. 201, 2.

that three of his disciples, Plotinus, Herennius, and the heathen Origen, were bound by a mutual engagement not to publish his doctrines. This engagement was first broken by Herennius, then Origen gave to the world some of his master's theories, and finally Plotinus composed the important writings which have come down to us.¹ But we cannot suppose that the latter was merely an expounder of Ammonius. On the contrary, we know that he took a line of his own, although Ammonius may have given the first impulse to his philosophical studies. The system of Ammonius seems to have been, in general terms, a scheme of comprehension, which was to answer the arguments derived from the discrepancies of philosophers by showing that, with Platonism for a connecting link, there was general agreement between the Stoics, Peripatetics, and Pythagoreans on the one side, and the Jewish, Egyptian, and Chaldæan traditions on the other. Those who adopted this scheme of comprehension were called 'Eclectics' (ἐκλεκτικοί), because they selected the points of agreement and rejected the points of difference in the various theories,² and the scheme itself was termed 'Syncretism' (συγκρητισμός), from the union of the mixed tribes in Crete against the common enemy.³ That Ammonius was the first founder of this school is expressly stated by Hierocles, who tells us⁴ that the contests of philosophers continued to the time of the inspired (θεοδίδακτος) Ammonius. 'He being first led by a religious impulse (οὗτος πρῶτος ἐνθουσίασας) to genuine philosophy, and overlooking the opinions of the many which brought the greatest reproach on philosophy, was well acquainted with both the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, and combined them in one and the same meaning, and taught philosophy free from discord to all his hearers, and especially to the best of his pupils, Plotinus, and Origen, and their followers.' Now what is thus distinctly attributed to Ammonius is ascribed by Diogenes of Laerte⁵ to Potamon of Alexandria, who flourished shortly before his own time (πρὸ ὀλίγου). The age of Dio-

¹ Porphyry, *Vit. Plotini*, c. 3, p. LII. Creuzer.

² Diog. Laërt. *ad fin. Proœmii*.

³ Plutarch, *De Fraternali Amore*, p. 490 B.

⁴ Photius, *Bibl. Cod. CCLI*. (p. 1382); cf. CCXIV. (p. 550).

⁵ *ad fin. Proœmii*.

genes is not known with certainty, but as he quotes Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, and Saturninus, he must have been a contemporary of Plotinus at the very earliest. The eclectic Potamon, therefore, cannot have been the same as the Alexandrian of that name, who, according to Suidas, flourished in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, and wrote a commentary on Plato's *Republic*. The Potamon mentioned by Porphyry as one of the disciples of Plotinus,¹ and who, by a mistaken translation, was converted into the parent of a child committed to that philosopher's care, is perhaps to be identified with a certain Polemon, whose verses were tolerated and whose sentimental weakness was predicted by his master. A similar effort of criticism or linguistic observation would remove Potamon of Alexandria from all competition with Ammonius as the founder of the Eclectic school,² and leave us, under the former name, only the commentator on Plato in the Augustan age.

The numerous writings³ which bear the mythological name of HERMES TRISMEGISTUS⁴ are productions of Egyptian Pla-

¹ *Plotini Vita*, 9, p. LX. Creuzer: ἐν τούτοις δὲ ἦν καὶ Ποτάμων οὗ τῆς παιδείσεως φροντίζων πολλάκις ἂν καὶ μετὰ ποιούντος ἠκροάσατο. Wytenbach, in a MS. note communicated to Creuzer (p. CII.), reads here Πολέμων and μέτρα ποιούντος, comparing *Vita Plotini*, 11: πρόειπε δὲ ἂν καὶ τῶν συνόντων παιδῶν περὶ ἐκάστου οἷος ἀπορήσεται ὡς καὶ περὶ Πολέμωνος οἷος ἔσται, ὅτι ἐρωτικὸς ἔσται καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνιος, ὁπερ καὶ ἀπέβη.

² It is quite possible that we ought to read in the passage cited above from the preface of Diogenes: ἐτι δὲ πρὸ ὀλίγου καὶ ἐκλεκτικὴ τις αἵρεσις εἰσέχθη ὑπὸ [Ποτ]αμώνος [i. Ἀμμωνίου] τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως. But there is no need to alter the text of Diogenes, for we may identify the Potamon, of whom he speaks, with the Ammonius, to whom he seems to refer, by supposing that the Egyptian name of the latter was really *Pot-amon* or *Pet-ammon*, 'he who belongs to Ammon,' of which Ἀμμώνιος is merely the Greek version. Thus רַעֲפָה (*Gen.* XXXVII, 36), LXX. Πετεφρῆς, Engl. *Potiphar*, and רַעֲפָה (*Gen.* XLI. 45), LXX. Πετεφρῆ, Engl. *Poti-pherah*, really represent the Egyptian *Petephres*, 'he that belongs to the Sun.' See Rosellini, *Monum. Storici*, I. 117. If the Potamon of Diogenes was Ammonius Saccas, a book called *στοιχείωσις*, or 'elementary instruction,' was attributed to the chief of the Eclectics.

³ See the list in Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* I. pp. 46—94, and Baumgarten-Crusius, *De Libr. Hermetic. Orig. et Indole*, Jen. 1827.

⁴ According to Clemens Alexandrinus, in a remarkable passage (*Strom.* VI. p. 757 sqq., Potter), there were forty-two books of Hermes, of which he gives the contents. See Bunsen, *Aegypten*, I. pp. 34, 35; Lepsius, *Chronologie*, I. 45, 46. Creuzer supposed that the forty-two columns of hieroglyphics under the ibis headed Thoth at Edfu referred to this number of books, and gave their contents, but,

tonists. Some belonged to the school of Philo, and were known to Plutarch;¹ others are of a much later date and not unaffected by the influence of Christianity.² The *Poimander* (Ποιμάνδρης) is perhaps even an imitation of the well-known *Pastor* of Hermas.³ These writings, which have borrowed their name from the god *Thoth*, who furnished Eratosthenes with a title for his astronomical poem, are only so far interesting as showing the extent to which the adoption and incorporation of existing beliefs and traditions were carried in the age which claims Ammonius as the founder of the eclectic scheme of comprehension.

§ 6. Whatever opinion we may form of the influence and importance of Ammonius, there can be no doubt that his pupil PLOTINUS occupies an eminent position in the later literature of Greece. This philosopher, whose name seems to indicate a connexion with the *Plotia gens*, was born at Lycopolis in Egypt A.D. 205.⁴ The slow development of his sickly frame did not prevent his early training, and after he had completed his scientific education, he betook himself, at the age of twenty-eight, to the study of philosophy. His other teachers sent him away dissatisfied and desponding; and having communicated his dissatisfaction to one of his companions, he was taken by him to hear Ammonius, of whom he had not yet made trial. After the first lecture he exclaimed to his friend: 'this is the man of whom I was in search.'⁵ For eleven years he attended diligently in the school of Ammonius, and when he was thirty-nine years old, he was inspired with a wish to visit the Brahmins and Magi, and for this purpose joined the expedition which the emperor Gordian was conducting against the Persians. The

according to Lepsius, the inscription is continuous, and not divided into forty-two chapters: see Parthey on Plutarch's *Isis et Osiris*, p. 255. The name *τρισμαχιστος* does not occur on the Egyptian monuments; Parthey, *l.c.* p. 155.

¹ *Is. et Os.* 61, p. 375 B.

² Such as the λόγος τέλειος and ὅροι.

³ For the references to Christianity in this book, see Baumgarten-Crusius, *u.s.* pp. 13 sqq.

⁴ He was sixty-six years old when he died, at the end of the second year of Claudius, and was therefore born in the thirteenth year of Severus (Porphyr. *Vit. Plotin.* 2. p. LI. Creuzer).

⁵ Porphyr. *ibid.*: τὸν δὲ εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἀκούσαντα φάναι πρὸς τὸν ἑταῖρον, τοῦτον ἐξήτουν.

defeat and death of Gordian obliged him to give up this design. With difficulty he made his escape to Antioch, and from thence proceeded to Rome.¹ Here he was established, in the fortieth year of his age, as a teacher of philosophy, and remained in Italy till his death in A.D. 270. At first, as has been mentioned, he abstained from publishing the esoteric doctrines of Ammonius; but when the secret was broken by his fellow-pupils, Herennius and Origen, he considered himself released from all obligations to silence, and he communicated the doctrines of his master in oral lectures, but in a very desultory and conversational manner.² In the first year of Gallienus (A.D. 254), Plotinus was induced by the solicitations of his friends to publish some of his lectures for the use of a select few among his hearers. When Porphyry came to Rome in A.D. 264, he found that this limited publication amounted to twenty-one books, of which he gives the titles.³ During the next six years, although Plotinus passed his summers in comparative idleness,⁴ he was induced, by Amelius and Porphyry, to add to the number of his literary productions, and composed twenty-four other books, of which the titles are also given, and which treat of questions as they were started in conversation with his most distinguished scholars.⁵ When Porphyry was in Sicily, whither he retired in the fifteenth year of the reign of Gallienus (A.D. 268), Plotinus wrote and sent to him five books on happiness, providence, the knowledge of substances, and love.⁶ And in the two remaining years of his life Plotinus wrote four other treatises.⁷ These fifty-four books, according to Porphyry, varied in style and power with the different ages at which they were composed. The first twenty-one showed a want of mature vigour. The best were the next twenty-four,

¹ Porphyry. *Vit. Plotin.* 2 (Creuzer), p. LII. § 97: μόλις φεύγων εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν διεσώθη καὶ Φιλίππου τὴν βασιλείαν κρατήσαντος, τεσσαράκοντα γεγονῶς ἔτη, εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀνεισιν.

² *Id. ibid.* § 98: ἦν δὲ ἡ διατριβὴ ὡς ἂν αὐτοῦ ζητεῖν προτρεπομένου τοὺς συνόντας ἀταξίας πλήρης καὶ πολλῆς φλυαρίας, ὡς Ἀμέλιος ἡμῖν διηγείτο.

³ *Ibid.* p. LIV.

⁴ *Ibid.* LV: τοῦ Πλωτίνου τὰς θερινὰς μὲν ἀγοντος ἀργοῦ, συνόντος δὲ ἄλλως ἐν ταῖς ὁμιλίαις.

⁵ *Id. ibid.* § 101: πολλῶν ἐξετάσεων ἐν ταῖς συνουσίαις γιγνομένων καὶ γράφειν αὐτὸν ἀξιούντων Ἀμελίου τε καὶ ἐμοῦ.

⁶ *Ibid.* c. 6, p. LVI.

⁷ *Ibid.* § 103.

excepting the shorter treatises among them. And the last nine, especially the last four of them, exhibited a decline of the author's faculties.¹ All the works of Plotinus were hastily and perhaps carelessly composed, and he never read over what he had committed to writing, principally on account of the weakness of his eyesight.² He trusted to the coherency of his unwritten thoughts,³ which were fuller than his power of expression; he wrote, when he was obliged to write, with the greatest distaste for the mechanical operation; his handwriting was indistinct, his orthography careless;⁴ his style often obscure, and sometimes barbarous. Under these circumstances, the editorship, which devolved on Porphyry, was attended with unusual difficulties; and the works, as we have them, must be regarded as bearing the same relation to the actual compositions of Plotinus, as the collections of aphorisms and sermons which our Dr. Whichcot's friends published after his death. The arrangement adopted by Porphyry was very characteristic of his Pythagorean tendencies. He was delighted, he tells us, to have to deal with fifty-four books, a multiple of the perfect and mystic numbers six and nine,⁵ and divided the collection into six *enneads* or groups of nine treatises connected by some unity of subject: the *first* comprised the moral positions;⁶ the *second* the physical discussions;⁷ the *third* the theory of the world;⁸ the *fourth* treated of the soul;⁹ the *fifth* of the intellect and of ideas;¹⁰ the *sixth* of entity, unity, and the good.¹¹ Again the

¹ *Ibid.* §§ 103, 104.

² *Ibid.* c. 8, p. LIX: γράψας γὰρ ἐκεῖνος δις τὸ γράφειν μεταβαλεῖν οὐδέ ποτ' ἂν ἠνέσχετο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἅπαξ γοῦν ἀναγνῶναι καὶ διελθεῖν διὰ τὸ τὴν ὄρασιν μὴ ὑπηρετεῖσθαι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν.

³ *Ibid.*: ἀδιάκοπον τηρεῖν τὴν διάνοιαν.

⁴ *Ibid.*: ἔγραψε δὲ οὔτε εἰς τὸ κάλλος ἀποτυπούμενος τὰ γράμματα, οὔτε εὐσήμεως τὰς συλλαβὰς διαιρῶν, οὔτε τῆς ὀρθογραφίας φροντίζων.

⁵ *Ibid.* c. 24, p. LXXVIII.: τῇ τελειότητι τοῦ ἑξ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ ταῖς ἐννεάσις ἀσμένως ἐπιτυχῶν. See Creuzer's note on this passage, and on *Ennead.* VI. lib. 6, p. 366.

⁶ *Ibid.*: ἡ πρώτη ἐννεὰς ἔχει τὰ ἠθικωτέρα τὰδε.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. LXXIX.: ἡ δὲ δευτέρα τῶν φυσικῶν συναγωγὴν ἔχουσα τὰ περὶ κόσμου καὶ τὰ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀνήκοντα περιέχει.

⁸ *Ibid.*: ἡ δὲ τρίτη, ἔτι τὰ περὶ κόσμου ἔχουσα, περιεῖλφε τὰ περὶ τῶν κατὰ κόσμον θεωρουμένων ταῦτα.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. LXXX.: ἡ δὲ τετάρτη τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς εἴληχε συγγράμματα.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: ἡ δὲ πέμπτη ἔχει τὰς περὶ νοῦ ὑποθέσεις.

¹¹ *Ibid.* c. 26, p. LXXXI.

first three *enneads*, the fourth and fifth, and the last, formed three separate bodies (σωμάτια).¹ It is quite clear that this arbitrary arrangement was necessitated by the difficulty which Porphyry experienced in endeavouring to systematize a number of occasional works written at such different periods of his master's intellectual activity. It is almost surprising, however, that it did not occur to him to recognize the diversity in the style of the works, which, as he himself has told us, was occasioned by this circumstance. But perhaps his veneration for the writer obliged him to believe that, after all, his thoughts were all golden and must have an inherent consistency, so that there was no real necessity for chronological distinctions.

During the long period of his residence at Rome, Plotinus enjoyed an estimation almost approaching to a belief in his superhuman sanctity and wisdom. His ascetic virtue, and the mysterious transcendentalism of his conversation, which made him the Coleridge of the day, seems to have carried away the minds of his associates, and raised them to a state of imaginative exaltation. He was regarded as a sort of prophet, divine himself, and capable of elevating his disciples to a participation in his divinity. Envious sorcerers could produce no effect on such a sage. Like the Brahmin hermits of the *Rāmāyana*, he was magic proof, and when Olympius the Alexandrian, who had been his fellow-pupil in the school of Ammonius, endeavoured to make him star-stricken by his magic arts, the machinations recoiled on himself, and he was shrivelled up like a purse and all his limbs were distorted.² Similarly, when the Egyptian priest³ came to Rome, and wished to exhibit his skill in calling up spirits, a god appeared as the tutelary spirit of Plotinus instead of one of the inferior dæmons.⁴ These coincidences, or collusions, show how sacred a character had

¹ Porphyry, *Vit. Plot.* § 145.

² *Id. ibid.* 10, § 110. p. LXI.: 'Ὀλύμπιος ἀστροβολῆσαι αὐτὸν μαγεύσας ἐπεχείρησεν, ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν στρεφόμενον ἦσθετο τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις μεγάλην εἶναι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ Πλωτίνου δύναμιν . . . Πλωτίνος μέντοι τοῦ 'Ὀλυμπίου ἐγχειροῦντος ἀντελαμβάνετο (*animadvertit*, Ficinus, *retinuit*, *cuhiluit*, Creuzer), λέγων αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα τότε ὡς τὰ σύσπαστα βαλάντια ἔλκεσθαι, τῶν μελῶν αὐτῷ πρὸς ἄλλα συναθρομένων.

³ *Id. ibid.* § 111: Αἰγύπτίως τις ἱερεὺς. 'Forsan Aneho ille ad quem Porphyrii epistola,' Fabricius.

⁴ θεὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μὴ τῶν δαιμόνων εἶναι γένους.

attached to Plotinus. And we see the same evidenced in his social influence. Men and women of the highest rank crowded around him, and his house was filled with young people of both sexes whom their parents when dying had committed to his care. Rogatianus, a senator and prætor elect, gave up his wealth and dignities, and lived as the humble bedesman of his friends,¹ devoting himself to ascetic² and contemplative philosophy. His self-denial obtained for him the approbation of Plotinus, who held him up as a pattern of philosophy, and he gained the more solid advantage of a perfect cure from the worst kind of rheumatic gout.³ The influence of Plotinus extended to the imperial throne itself. The weak-minded Gallienus and his empress Salonina were so completely guided by the philosopher, that he had actually obtained permission to convert a ruined city in Campania into a *Platonopolis*, in which the laws of Plato's *Republic* were to be tested by a practical experiment; and the philosopher had promised to retire thither accompanied by his chief friends.⁴ The execution of this visionary scheme was prevented by some of the emperor's advisers, not, we may suppose, from some bad motive, as Porphyry suggests,⁵ but because their judgment was sounder than that of Gallienus and his philosophical father-confessor.

The general tendency of Plotinus, as a metaphysical theorist, may be gathered from many circumstances recorded by his biographer. His feeble constitution, which, contrary to the rules of his master Plato, he was obliged to nurse by a most elaborate system of nosotrophy,⁶ increased his contempt for the animal frame in which his divine spirit was encased. He would never allow his portrait or bust to be taken, and when he was pressed by his friend Amelius to sit for his likeness,

¹ Porphyr. c. 7, § 106, p. LVIII.

² The commentators are at variance as to the phrase: *σιτεῖσθαι παρὰ μίαν*. Fabricius says it means *altero quolibet die*, and Ficinus, *cibum in dies unicum assumebat*. It obviously denotes that 'he fasted on alternate days,' for *παρ' ἡμέραν* means 'every other day;' Soph. *Aj.* 471. τί γὰρ παρ' ἡμαρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει; Aristoph. *Ran.* 645: πλεγγὴ παρὰ πλεγγὴν ἐκότερον.

³ *Ibid.*: ποδαγρώντα μὲν οὕτως ὥς καὶ διέφρω βαστάζεσθαι ἀναβῶσθῆναι.

⁴ *Id.* c. 12, § 114, p. LXIII.

⁵ *Ibid.*: φθονοῦντες ἢ νεμεσῶντες ἢ δι' ἄλλην τινα αἰτίαν μοχθηράν.

⁶ *Id.* 2, § 93, p. 4.

he said: 'Is it not sufficient to carry about the image, which nature has placed around us, and must one leave behind a more lasting image of this image, as though it were something worth looking at?'¹ It is added that Amelius gained his object by introducing the artist Carterius into the lecture room of Plotinus, and getting him to draw his portrait from memory.² In the same spirit of sublime contempt for his lower nature, he addressed the following words to Eustochius, the only friend who attended his death-bed, and who had been slow in coming from Puteoli to the Campanian villa of his friend Zethus, where he died: 'I am still waiting here to take leave of you, and now I am endeavouring to lead up the divine principle which resides in us to that which lives in the universe.' He expired immediately afterwards; and the lovers of the marvellous were gratified by the assurance that, as his breath left his body, a serpent glided from under his bed and made its escape by a hole in the wall.³ This asceticism and contempt for material existence was probably a result of the oriental ingredients in his early training. We have seen that he wished to accompany Gordian on his Persian expedition in A.D. 242-3. The system of Manichæus, who was born in A.D. 240, and died in A.D. 277, shows what results might be derived from philosophizing on the dualism of the Persians. Whether Plotinus had access to the materials from which Manichæus constructed his theory,⁴ or whether that heretic, who was well acquainted with Greek literature, had obtained a knowledge of the doctrines of Plotinus, or, what is more likely, of Numenius, cannot be known; but it is obvious that Plotinus and Manichæus had much in common, notwithstanding the statement that the former was strongly opposed to the system of Zoroaster. This opposition was conducted rather by his pupils Porphyry and Amelius

¹ Porphyry, 1, § 92: οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ φέρειν δ' ἡ φύσις εἰδωλὸν ἡμῖν περιτέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ εἰδώλου εἰδωλὸν συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν πολυχρονιώτερον καταλιπεῖν ὥς δὴ τι τῶν ἀξιοθεάτων ἔργων;

² *Ibid.* § 93.

³ *Ibid.* §§ 94, 95: ἐπειδὴ Εὐστόχιος βραδέως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφίκετο, εἰπὼν ὅτι σὲ ἔτι περιμένω, καὶ φήσας πειρᾶσθαι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν θεῖον ἀνάγειν πρὸς τὸ ἐν παντὶ θεῖον, δράκοντος ὑπὸ τὴν κλινὴν διελθόντος, ἐν ᾗ κατέκειτο, καὶ εἰς ὁπὴν ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ ὑπάρχουσαν ὑποδεδυκτός, ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

⁴ There is a direct reference to one of the main positions of the Manichæans in *Ennead.* V. 8. 8, p. 1015, l. 17, Creuzer.

than by himself; and the work, in which the former charged with spuriousness a book attributed to Zoroaster,¹ may have been directed against one of the Manichæan reproductions. The simple and intelligible statement² that Plotinus resolved physiology into magic, and ethics into asceticism—that his theory of nature rested on a belief in certain magical affinities—and that virtue, according to his view, was merely a purification from the corporeal or sensible—shows that his opposition to the Gnostics and to the Persian dualists must have sprung from differences of detail, and that he really concurred with them in the main practical results of their doctrines. He did not adopt the system of emanations, and his triad of the good, the mind, and the soul,³ was neither the Christian Trinity,⁴ nor the Manichæan caricature of it—namely, the Supreme Being, with his accessaries, Mithras and the Paraclete. But his belief that the sun and the stars are animated beings⁵ is Zoroastrian, and he undoubtedly shows a leaning to the hieroglyphic mysteries of his own countrymen the Egyptians.⁶ And though he makes some very sensible observations on the absurdity of the notion entertained by the Jews and other eastern nations that dæmons are the cause of certain maladies,⁷ he does not relinquish the oriental machinery of intermediate existences,⁸ and even believes that every man has his own genius or attendant spirit.⁹ Many of his doctrines sound like echoes of the *Sankhya* theories of the Indians, though he does not mention them by name; and it is quite clear that in more than one passage he makes tacit refer-

¹ Porph. *Vit. Plot.* c. 16, § 119, p. LXVI.: Πορφύριος δὲ ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸ Ζωροάστρου συγγρῶς πεποιθήμην ἐλέγχους κ.τ.λ.

² See Ritter, *Hist. Phil.* vol. IV. p. 606.

³ The Triad of Plotinus was (1) τὸ ἀγάθον, (2) ὁ νοῦς, (3) ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ παντός. See *Ennead.* II. 9. 1, p. 358 sqq., Creuzer. Cf. III. 5. 3, V. 2. 1, V. 1. 6, V. 1. 3.

⁴ See Cæsar Morgan, *on the Trinity of Plato and Philo-Judeus*, pp. 125 sqq., ed. Holden, Cambridge, 1853.

⁵ *Ennead.* V. 1. 2, p. 900, Creuzer.

⁶ *Ennead.* V. 8. 6, p. 1011, Cr.

⁷ *Ennead.* II. 9. 14, p. 386, Cr. The passage is well worthy of the attention of those who still uphold the reality of dæmoniacal possession.

⁸ *Ennead.* III. 4. 6, p. 519, Cr. The disembodied souls of good men are also, according to his views, a sort of beneficent dæmons; IV. 7. 15, p. 871.

⁹ *Ibid.* passim, and see Creuzer's note, vol. III. pp. 160, 161.

ence to Philo.¹ It is probable that he was not acquainted with Christianity except through the Gnostics, to whom he is as strongly opposed as Hippolytus or any other Christian bishop : but his express denial of a bodily resurrection would have placed him at once in direct antagonism to any true follower of St. Paul.²

The relation in which Plotinus stood to his predecessors among the Greek philosophers is very easily stated. He had made himself acquainted with every system, and culled from them all whatever seemed to support his solution of the great problems of thought and existence. Plato is the chief authority and the starting-point in his speculations. But he takes full cognizance of Aristotle, whose system of categories he directly opposes;³ and he endeavours in all essential points to identify the doctrines of the Old Academy and the Lyceum.⁴ To effect this, he is obliged to have recourse to an overstrained latitude of interpretation, sometimes making his own inferences from opinions half expressed, and not unfrequently quoting from memory. Although he is strongly at variance with the Stoics on the grounds of knowledge, treating with great contempt their doctrine of intellectual conception, he borrows a good deal from Chrysippus, wherever he can find an agreement even in expression. The older writers also furnished him with sug-

¹ e.g. in II. 9. 1.

² *Ennead.* III. 6. 6: ἡ δ' ἀληθινὴ ἐγρήγορσις, ἀληθινὴ ἀπὸ σώματος, οὐ μετὰ σώματος, ἀνάστασις. ἡ μὲν γὰρ μετὰ σώματος, μετὰστασίς ἐστιν, ἐξ ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλον ὕπνον, ὅλον ἐξ ἐτέρων δεμνίων· ἡ δ' ἀληθὴς, ὅλως ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων, ἃ τῆς φύσεως ὄντα τῆς ἐναντίας ψυχῇ, τὸ ἐναντίον εἰς οὐσίαν ἔχει. Creuzer (III. p. 348) has called attention to a striking resemblance between St. Paul's expression in 1 *Cor.* XIII. 12, and Plotinus, *Ennead.* VI. 2. 22.

³ See Creuzer's note on *Ennead.* VI. 1, init. pp. 319 sqq.

⁴ The reader may take for an example his method of dealing with the theory of numbers in *Ennead.* VI. 6. Trendelenburg says (*Gesch. d. Kategorienlehre*, 1846, p. 232): 'Plotinus applies himself anew to a doctrine of categories, but what he brings forward is a sort of combination of Platonic and Aristotelian elements. In three of his books he treats of the categories: in *Ennead.* VI. 1, he submits Aristotle and the Stoics to a critical examination; in VI. 2, he treats of the categories of the intelligible; in VI. 3, of the categories of the perceptible. He combats Aristotle, but what he gives himself stands entirely and absolutely on Aristotle's foundations, only that he endeavours here, as in other particulars, to make the Aristotelian elements serviceable to Plato. It remains a question, however, whether a harmonious mixture is the result, or rather only a medley.'

gestive materials. He was acquainted with Anaxagoras, Democritus, Empedocles, Parmenides, and the most ancient Pythagoreans.¹ And he refers directly to the later Peripatetics, Aristoxenus and Dicaearchus.² He cannot, then, be termed strictly or exclusively a Neo-Platonist; he is equally a Neo-Aristotelian, and a Neo-Philosopher in general. He has himself one pervading idea, to which he is always recurring, and to which he accommodates as far as he can the reasonings of all his predecessors. It is his object to proclaim and exalt the immanent divinity of man, to raise the soul to a contemplation of the good and the true, and to vindicate its independence of all that is sensuous, transitory, and special. With an enthusiasm bordering on fanaticism, he proclaims his philosophical faith in an unseen world; and rejecting with indignation 'the humiliating attempt to make out that the spiritual world is no better than an essence or elixir drained off from the material—that thoughts are merely the shadows and ghosts of sensations,' he tells his disciples that 'the inward eyes of Consciousness and Conscience required to be purged and unscaled at the fountain of heavenly radiance before they can discern the true form and colour and value of spiritual objects.'³

For a detailed account of the philosophy of Plotinus we must refer the reader to the professed historians of ancient philosophy.⁴ His literary character may be briefly described. The reader of the *Enneads* will be most struck by the great inequality of the style, and by a perpetual and wearisome repetition of the same thoughts. This is fully explained by the fact that the collection which we have is made up of works written hastily to answer questions from pupils at different periods of the author's life, and subsequently arranged, according to the order of the subjects, by admiring friends who did not feel themselves at liberty to remodel or abridge these fugitive essays. It has indeed been supposed that the edition which has come down to

¹ See e.g. *Ennead*. IV. 7. p. 847, Creuzer, where he refers to Democritus. Fabricius has drawn up a list of all the eminent men mentioned by Plotinus; see Creuzer's *Prolegomena*, pp. XL., XLI.

² *Ennead*. III. 6, p. 560, l. 7, Creuzer. IV. 7, p. 847, l. 10, Creuzer.

³ Hare, *Victory of Faith*, p. 41.

⁴ A good general sketch is given by Creuzer, *Prolegomena*, p. XXVI. sqq.

us is a combination of the two recensions by Porphyry and Eustochius.¹ Be that as it may, we can no more regard the *Enneads* of Plotinus as an elaborate and methodical production of literary genius, than we could form that opinion of the posthumous publication of a number of sermons, representing the preaching of some divine during the best part of his life, and arranged according to their subjects by some members of his congregation. The style of Plotinus² varies with his subject, and perhaps with the author whose writings on that subject were immediately in his recollection. When he is treating of some more popular topic, he writes intelligibly, sensibly, and pleasantly. When he can hardly grasp his own meaning, he writes obscurely and confusedly. But everywhere there are marks of negligence, or of an incomplete mastery of the resources of the Greek language. At the best he is an imitator of some classical model. At one time we have a Thucydidean brevity; at another time the preciseness of Aristotle; frequently he flows on in the diffuse eloquence of Plato's diction; sometimes he rises to flights of poetic extravagance; and occasionally he exhibits traces of the figurative language and antithetic constructions of his Oriental models. In general, it may be said that Plotinus is better fitted to be read in a judicious collection of elegant extracts than for a continuous perusal in his collected works, and we are sure that not even the typographical magnificence with which the University of Oxford has put forth the excellent edition of Creuzer³ will procure students for Plotinus at the expense of the time which ought to be bestowed on Plato and Aristotle.

§ 7. The most eminent among the immediate scholars of

¹ This is Creuzer's conjecture; see his note on *Ennead*. IX. 1, vol. III. p. 79. On the double recension in general, see Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 696, Harl. (in Creuzer's *Prolegomena*), and Creuzer's notes, vol. III. pp. 98, 202, 253. There are certain discrepancies between the text of Plotinus and the extract given by Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* XV. 22, which have also a difference in the title; see Creuzer, III. p. 247, who thinks that Porphyry sometimes abridged Plotinus, as in the discussion of Aristotle's *Entelechia: ad Vit. Plot.* p. CXXI.

² Porphyry's description of his style (*Vit. Plot.* c. 14, p. LXIV. Creuzer) is as follows: ἐν τῷ γράφειν σύντομος γέγονε καὶ πολύνους, βραχὺς τε καὶ νοήμασι πλεονάζων ἢ λέξει, τὰ πολλὰ ἐνθουσιῶν καὶ ἐκπαθῶς φράζων, καὶ τὸ [μετὰ?] συμπαθείας [μᾶλλον?] ἢ παραδόσεως.

³ *Oxonii*, 1835, in three volumes 4to.

Plotinus were Amelius and Porphyry, the latter of whom occupies a very important place among the later Greek writers.

AMELIUS, or more properly AMERIUS, was merely the ethnical name of GENTILIANUS, a native of Ameria in Umbria.¹ Originally a laborious student of the works of Numenius, he became a regular attendant at the lectures of Plotinus in the third year after that philosopher came to Rome, and never left him till the end of his life, when he retired to Apamea in Syria, the native place of Numenius.² He had the honour of convincing Porphyry of the truth of the doctrines of Plotinus, and was joined with him in the successful effort to induce their common master to commit his doctrines to writing. His principal work was a treatise in forty books intended to prove, in opposition to Zostrianus, that Numenius was not entitled to be considered as the original author of the doctrines of Plotinus.³ Connected with Porphyry by their admiration for their common master, Amelius differed from him very widely in his appreciation of Christianity. Whether he was eventually a Christian is not known.⁴ But he is cited by Eusebius and others⁵ as having quoted with great approbation St. John's definition of the Logos, and he is probably meant by Augustine when he speaks of a certain Platonist, who said that the beginning of St. John's Gospel ought to be written in letters of gold and set in the most conspicuous place in every church.⁶

¹ Porphyry, *Vit. Plotin.* c. 7, p. LVII. Creuzer : 'Ἀμέλιον ἀπὸ τῆς Τουσκίας, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα ἦν Γεντιλιανὸς τὸ κύριον· αὐτὸς δὲ διὰ τοῦ ρ Ἀμέριον αὐτὸν καλεῖν ἤξλου, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμερίας ἢ τῆς ἀμελείας πρέπειν αὐτῷ καλεῖσθαι λέγων. Ameria, which is in Umbria, and not in ancient Etruria, is now called *Amelia*, so that the change of name may have been due merely to a difference of articulation.

² Hence he is erroneously called Ἀπαμεὺς by Suidas.

³ Porphyry, *Vit. Plotin.* c. 16. § 119, p. LXVI. Creuzer.

⁴ Gibbon, referring to him, says (vol. III. p. 48, note 20, ed. W. Smith): 'the Platonists admired the beginning of the Gospel of St. John, as containing an exact transcript of their own opinions,' and Creuzer remarks (p. XCV): 'hic sibi persuaserat λόγου appellationem e philosophiâ Platoniciâ in Joannis Evangelium translatam, et cum hujus exordium vehementer admiratus esset in loco I. 34, aliam distinctionem instituerat.' And this may have been the extent of his Christianity.

⁵ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* XI. 19, p. 143, Heinichen; Theod. *Gr. affect.* II. p. 33; Cyrill. *c. Julian.* VIII. p. 283, quoted by Bentley, *Remarks on Prethinking*, p. 456, ed. Randolph.

⁶ August. *De Civ. Dei*, X. 29: 'Quod initium S. Evangelii, cui nomen est

PORPHYRY owes the name by which he is so well known to the fashion of translating foreign designations which was common in that age.¹ He was born in A.D. 233 at Batanea,² the Bashan of the Old Testament, and his native name was that of the servant who was wounded by St. Peter, namely, *Malchus* (i.e. *Melek*, 'a king'). It was his friend Amelius who, in the dedication of his book in defence of Plotinus, converted the Semitic name into *Basileus*, and Longinus, it seems, subsequently changed this substantive into the adjective *Porphyrus* (πορφύριος, 'clad in purple or royal robes'), which was intended as a synonym.³ He was a pupil of Origen at Cæsarea, and afterwards went to Athens, where he was instructed by Longinus in rhetoric and in that form of Neo-Platonism which the great critic still maintained, but which was very different from the theory of Plotinus. When he came to Rome, for the second time, at the age of thirty, and joined the school of Plotinus there,⁴ he wrote a book to combat some of his new teacher's doctrines. Amelius was deputed to answer this challenge, and did so in a treatise of some length. The controversy was extended to a reply by Porphyry, and a rejoinder by Amelius, when the former admitted his error, and read a recantation before his fellow disciples.⁵ From this time he became one of the most zealous adherents of Plotinus, and so entirely obtained the confidence of that philosopher that he was intrusted with

secundum Joannem, quidam Platonius aureis litteris conscribendum, et per omnes ecclesias in locis eminentissimis proponendum esse dicebat.'

¹ Besides the case of Numenius and Porphyry, we have *Paulinus*, whom Amelius called Μίκαλος (Porphyry. *Vit. Plot.* c. 7, p. LVII.), and Maximus, whom Numenius called Μέγαλος (*id.* c. 17, p. LXVII.).

² He calls himself a Tyrian (*Vit. Plot.* p. LIX.), and Eunapius says his native place was Tyre (*in Porph.* p. 7). Perhaps Τύριον is a corruption for Σύριον. At any rate, Jerome and Chrysostom call him Βασιλειωτης (Creuzer, p. C.)

³ Eudocia supposed he was called 'the purple man' from being a Tyrian! See Creuzer's note, p. CXV. Longinus had called him *Malchus* in a letter addressed to him and Cleodamas: *Vit. Plotini*, 17. p. LXVII.

⁴ Suidas (s.v. 'Αμέλιος) is mistaken in saying that Amelius was a teacher of Porphyry.

⁵ *Vit. Plotini*, c. 18. p. LXVIII. Creuzer: μόλις συνελθὺς τὰ λεγόμενα ἐγὼ ὁ Πορφύριος μετεθέμην καὶ παλινωδίαν γράψας ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ ἀνέγνω. It seems that a reference to this *Palinode* has crept in from the margin to the text of Timæus' *Lexicon Platonicum* s.v. οὐκ ἤκιστα. See Ruhken, *ad l.* and *Præf.* p. IX. ed. Koch.

the duty of arranging and publishing his works, and has also favoured us with a rather egotistical but very enthusiastic biography of the author of the *Enneads*. His intercourse with Plotinus continued for about six years, when the contempt for the flesh, which he had gained in his transcendental studies, assumed the form of a settled melancholy, and ideas of suicide arose in his mind. To divert his thoughts Plotinus recommended a journey to Sicily, and Porphyry was residing there when his master died.¹ He then returned to Rome; and here, in all probability, he spent the remainder of his life, which was protracted to a very advanced age. He tells us, in his life of Plotinus, that he was sixty-eight when he had the only theophany with which he was ever favoured.² When quite an old man he married a Christian widow, named Marcella, with seven children, and we have still a letter³ written about ten months after their marriage, and containing an outline of his practical philosophy. When he died is not mentioned; but it was of course after A.D. 302, as he was more than sixty-eight when he wrote the life of Plotinus.

For the age in which he lived Porphyry was a good writer, and his learning was stupendous.⁴ In philosophy he was little more than a commentator on Plotinus; but his Syrian origin and the Orientalism in which he was brought up made him incline more than his master to the tenets of the new Pythagoreans, and his peculiar temperament made him an advocate of thaumaturgy, even if he was not a sincere believer in it.

¹ *Vit. Plot.* c. 11, pp. LXII., LXIII. Creuzer.

² *Ibid.* c. 23, p. LXXVII.: *ᾧ δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Πορφύριος ἀπαξ λέγω πλησιᾶσαι καὶ ἐνωθῆναι ἔτος ἄγων ἐξήκοστόν τε καὶ ὄγδοον.*

³ Published from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library by Cardinal Mai (*Mediol.* 1816).

⁴ Of the style of Porphyry, Eunapius says (p. 9, Boiss.): *ὁ Πορφύριος, ὥσπερ Ἑρμαϊκὴ τις σειρὰ καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπινεύουσα, διὰ ποικίλης παιδείας πάντα εἰς τὸ εὖγνωστον καὶ καθαρὸν ἐξήγγελλεν.* For his learning, see Augustin. *Civ. Dei.* XIX. 22: 'doctissimus philosophorum Porphyrius quamvis Christianorum acerrimus inimicus;' XXV.: 'philosophus nobilis;' XXXII.: 'homo non mediocri ingenio præditus;' and in another place: 'magnus gentilium philosophus.' Even Eusebius calls him ὁ γενναῖος φιλόσοφος, ὁ θαυμαστὸς θεόλογος, ὁ τῶν ἀπορρήτων μύστης (*Præp. Evang.* V. 14, 211, Heinichen). As Longinus was called τῶν γραμματικῶν φιλοσοφώτατος, so Porphyry was termed τῶν φιλοσόφων γραμματικώτατος: see Wyttenb. *ad Eunap.* p. 7, Boiss.

His violent opposition to Christianity was no doubt occasioned by the feelings so well described by Gibbon. 'The prevailing sect of the new Platonicians,' says our great historian,¹ 'judged it prudent to connect themselves with the priests, whom they despised, against the Christians, whom they had reason to fear. These fashionable philosophers prosecuted the design of extracting allegorical wisdom from the fictions of the Greek poets; instituted mysterious rites of devotion for the use of their chosen disciples; recommended the worship of the ancient gods as the emblems or ministers of the Supreme Deity, and composed against the faith of the Gospel many elaborate treatises, which have since been committed to the flames by the prudence of orthodox emperors.' It is clear, however, that Porphyry had but little faith in the old polytheism of the Greeks. He expressly tells his wife that outward worship does neither good nor harm, and in his letter to Anebos he raises doubts as to the efficacy even of the theurgic arts, which were so intimately connected with his own dæmonology. His religion, so far as he had any, was that of an Oriental ascetic, who believed that all happiness and all duty consisted in ignoring the conditions of that composite existence from which death would set him free.

We have the titles of nearly sixty works attributed to Porphyry.² Of these the most important or best known are the following:

(a) 'A life of Pythagoras.' This is merely a fragment, and probably belonged to his general history of the philosophers.

(b) 'On the life of Plotinus and the arrangement of his works.' This is the well-known biography to which we are indebted for all our information respecting the career of the great Neo-Platonist.

(c) 'On abstinence from the flesh of animals' (περὶ ἀποχῆς τῶν ἐμψύχων). This celebrated treatise, consisting of four books, is addressed to a recreant Pythagorean, who had relapsed into the use of animal food. Though the principles of asceticism

¹ *Roman Empire*, c. XVI. II. p. 266, ed. W. Smith.

² A learned and satisfactory sketch of the literary history of Porphyry was published at Rome in 1630 by Lucas Holstenius of Hamburg: *Dissertatio de Vita et Scriptis Porphyrii philosophi*.

are generally maintained, the writer's chief object seems to have been to recommend a more spiritual worship in the place of the sacrificial system of the heathen world,¹ with all its false notions and practical abuses. This work is valuable on many accounts, and full of information.

(d) 'The Epistle to Anebo' is an effort of scepticism directed against opinions which Porphyry himself entertained at one period of his life. He raises doubts as to the truth of dualism and dæmonology, and as to the efficacy of theurgic arts, incantations, and animal sacrifice. The work provoked a reply generally attributed to his scholar Iamblichus. The epistle itself is known to us only from some fragments and extracts preserved by Eusebius.

(e) 'On the grotto of the nymphs in the Odyssey.' This is an allegorical interpretation of the passage in the thirteenth book of the poem, describing the cave in Ithaca, near which Ulysses landed. It is an amusing specimen of the spirit in which Porphyry explained the old epic poem. The cave represents the world, in a sense half Platonic² and half Zoroastrian, and the water nymphs to whom it belonged are human souls on the road to their union with the bodies which they are destined to inhabit,³ 'for these,' as Numenius says, 'sit by the water because it was inbreathed by divinity,'⁴ according to the saying of the prophet Moses; though the wisest soul, that which is pure from bodily generation, is dry according to Heracleitus.⁵ We have also a sample of his commentary on the *Iliad* in the shape of thirty-two 'Homeric questions.'

(f) 'Against the Christians,' in fifteen books.⁶ This cele-

¹ As it seemed to impugn also the sacrifices of the Jews, this work of Porphyry's was answered by Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, in a book entitled *κατὰ Πορφύριου περὶ ζώων καὶ θυσίων*. See Suidas, s.v. *Διόδωρος μονάζων*.

² He says of the cave, that is, of the world, that it is *ἐπήρατον τῷ εὐθὺς ἐντὺ γ-χάνοντι διὰ τὴν τῶν εἰδῶν μέθεξιν*, *ἡρωειδὲς δὲ σκοποῦντι τὴν ὑποβάθραν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν εἰσέλονται τῷ νῦν* (p. 107, l. 20, Holsten.), which is very Platonic.

³ p. 111, l. 30, Holstenius, ed. 1630: *τὰς εἰς γένεσιν κατιούσας ψυχὰς*.

⁴ *Ibid.* l. 32: *ἡγοῦντο γὰρ προσιζάνειν τῷ ὕδατι τὰς ψυχὰς θεοπνύω ὄντι ὡς φησιν ὁ Νουμῆνιος*.

⁵ p. 115, l. 26: *αὐτὸς δὲ φησιν Ἡράκλειτος ξηρὰ ψυχὴ σοφωτάτη*.

⁶ This work was written during the author's stay in Sicily, about the time of the death of Plotinus. Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 19, p. 199, Heinichen: *ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Σικελίᾳ καταστὰς Πορφύριος*; Jerome, *De Script. Eccles.*: 'Contra Porphyrium qui

brated work, which was answered by Eusebius in twenty-five books, is known to us only from the notices of it in Jerome's commentary and other ecclesiastical writings. Its loss is due to Theodosius II., who ordered it to be publicly burned in A.D. 435, a proceeding which only shows that the apologists had not been successful in answering all its allegations. Modern biblical criticism has sanctioned many of the opinions to which Porphyry first gave a definite expression. But, whether right or wrong, it is to be regretted that we no longer possess a book exhibiting a real acquaintance with the subject, and stating the difficulties which must, sooner or later, have demanded a solution.¹

Besides these, the letter to his wife Marcella, the introduction and commentaries on the *Categories* and *Ethics* of Aristotle, the outline of the philosophy of Plotinus (πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμαί), commentaries on Ptolemy, and the poetical fragment on the philosophy of oracles (περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας), are preserved in a form more or less complete, and are more or less known to modern students.

In the reign of Trajan, a Syrian rhetorician named IAMBlichus² had gained some distinction, especially by a prolix love-story in thirty-nine books, called *Babylonica*, which existed in manuscript down to the end of the seventeenth century, when it was destroyed by fire. A namesake and perhaps a descendant of this writer was the most celebrated pupil of Porphyry. This

eodem tempore scribebat in Siciliâ ut quidam putant.' See Holsten. *Dissert.* pp. 19 sqq.

¹ The first book discussed the contradictions and other marks of human fallibility in the Scriptures; the third treated of Scriptural interpretation, and strangely enough repudiated the allegories of Origen; the fourth examined the ancient history of the Jews; and the twelfth and thirteenth maintained the point now generally admitted by scholars, that Daniel is not a prophecy, but a retrospective history of the age of Antiochus Epiphanes: see Holstenius, *Dissert.* pp. 81—88.

² The name Ἰάμβλιχος, which should be pronounced with the penultima long, seems to be an Arabic form. It is borne by an Arab sheik of the Emessenes, near Chalcis, mentioned by Strabo, XVI. p. 753, and the Semitic designation is no doubt that of a sheik of the semi-Arabic tribe of the Simeonites, namely ʾIambēk (1 *Chron.* IV. 34), the β being inserted in the Greek orthography according to the rule. There is no reason to connect the name with that of Ἰαμβρόης (2 *Tim.* III. 8), which some suppose to be a corruption of *Mamres* and others of *Ambrosius* (Winer, *Realwörterb.* I. pp. 534, 5), nor with that of *Iambūlus*, the Indian writer mentioned by Diodorus.

younger IAMBlichus was born at Chalcis in Cœle-Syria, and was a contemporary of Constantine and Julian. He died somewhere about A.D. 330—333. Little or nothing is known of the circumstances of his life; but he became the apostle of moribund heathenism, without, as it seems, any originality, or even any remarkable literary talents. He was merely one of those bigots who, when some form of superstition is falling to pieces, step forward with desperate arguments on its behalf, and are greeted with the extravagant applause of the partizans whose cause they have espoused. No sophistries are too worthless, no pretensions are too absurd, when they appear in support of a creed or a dogma, which is felt to be untenable, but which people are determined to maintain. This is the explanation of the encomium bestowed by an able man like Julian on this Iamblichus, who was not only an enthusiast, but an impostor. The accomplished apostate from Christianity would not have declared that Iamblichus was the equal of Plato, differing from him only in the age at which he appeared,¹ if he had not regarded him as a useful advocate of the paganism to which that prince had perversely retrograded. As far as we can gather, Iamblichus was a mere compiler, if not a plagiarist. He had no distinctive opinions; and he fell back on the juggling artifices and pretended miracles of the school of Apollonius of Tyana.

The following are the best known works of Iamblichus:—

(a) ‘On the philosophy or sect of Pythagoras,’² originally in ten books, of which five are extant. The first book, containing the life, is a worthless production; not only compiled at random from all sources, including Porphyry, whom he copies, but filled with incidents resting on no adequate authority. To the same work belonged ‘the second book of Pythagorean commentaries,’³ which, besides some details respecting the system of Pythagoras, contains a number of extracts from Plato, selected without any judgment, and arranged without any method. The third book, entitled ‘on the common mathematical science,’⁴ has some value from the fragments of Philolaus and Archytas which it contains.

¹ *Orat.* IV. p. 146; *Epist.* 40.

² *περὶ Πυθαγόρου αἰρέσεως.*

³ It is entitled *προτρεπτικοὶ λόγοι εἰς φιλοσοφίαν.*

⁴ *περὶ κοινῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης.*

The fourth book is headed 'on the arithmetical introduction of Nicomachus.'¹ In the fifth and sixth books, which are lost, he treated of physics and ethics. The seventh still remains, with the title, 'the theology of arithmetic.'² The other three books were 'on music,'³ 'on geometry,'⁴ and 'on the sphæric theory of Pythagoras.'⁵

(b) 'A reply to the letter addressed by Porphyry to Anebo.' This is put forth in the name of 'Abammon the teacher,'⁶ and is generally cited by the title 'on the mysteries.'⁷ Of the ten sections into which it is divided, only the last three treat of the Egyptian mythology. A scholiast cited by Proclus assigns the authorship to Iamblichus. It is filled with theurgic absurdities, but has recently been edited, with critical and laborious accuracy, by an eminent expounder of Egyptian lore.⁸

¹ περὶ τῆς Νικομάχου ἀριθμητικῆς εἰσαγωγῆς.

² τὰ θεολογούμενα τῆς ἀριθμητικῆς. It has been published with an elaborate commentary by Ast (Lips. 1816), who says of it in his preface: 'nullus fere liber exstat, in quo Pythagoreorum et Platoniorum de numeris rationes opinionumque commenta tam copiose explicata reperiantur.'

³ Iamblich. *Vit. Pythag.* 120.

⁴ *Ad Nicom.* p. 141.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 176.

⁶ The full title is: 'Ἀβάμμωνος διδασκάλου πρὸς τὴν Πορφυρίου πρὸς Ἀνεβῶ ἐπιστολὴν ἀποκρίσις καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπορημάτων λύσεις.

⁷ περὶ μυστηρίων.

⁸ Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, ad manuscriptorum fidem recognovit Gustav Parthey. Berol. 1857.

CHAPTER LIV.

THE OPPOSITE TENDENCY.—LUCIAN.

§ 1. Opposition to oriental enthusiasm. § 2. Stoicism in its relations to Neo-Platonism. Arrian's *Epictetus* and M. Aurelius. § 3. Lucian : an opponent of oriental superstitions and impostures. § 4. His works. § 5. Longinus : a seceder from the Neo-Platonic school. § 6. His merits as a critic, and the causes of his general celebrity.

§ 1. WHEN reflecting men have convinced themselves that there is an opposition within the sphere of their personal existence, that the flesh is always striving against the spirit, and that it is the first obligation of a reasonable being to assert and maintain the supremacy of his higher nature, they are led, in spite of an agreement in these general principles, to two widely-different courses of philosophical theory and practical morality, by two diverging tendencies of intellectual constitution and nervous temperament. Those who have naturally a strong imagination, or whose imagination has been stimulated to unhealthy activity by a corresponding form of religious worship and literary culture, are not content to recognize the struggle within themselves : they must needs see it reflected in the universe. As we have already intimated,¹ this tendency finds its completion in a system of dualism, with all its religious and philosophical consequences. Two opposing kingdoms of light and darkness correspond to the antagonism between spirit and flesh, and they are peopled with fantastic hosts of good and evil beings, connected respectively with the source of life and reason in man, and the crude matter in which it is enveloped. As an obvious extension of this belief, the spirit of man, in proportion as it triumphs over the matter with which it is connected, is supposed capable of sharing in the empire which spirit exercises over matter in the outer world. Accordingly, the ascetic saint

¹ Chapter LIII. § 1.

becomes a worker of miracles—a master of dæmons, who hear his voice and obey—a controller of material nature, on which he impresses new laws and conditions. When the intellectual speculation, which endeavours to grapple with the laws of mind and matter, accommodates itself to the presuppositions of this system of theology, it can no longer enjoy an independent existence. With physiology turned into thaumaturgy and magic, and ethics represented by asceticism, philosophy forms an unnatural alliance with the dualism of the east, and adopts, with certain interpretations, the religious mythology which had already connected popular superstition with sacerdotal mysteries. We have seen how this tendency, in its influence on the Greek mind, was developed by the Pythagorean and Platonic schools which began with Philo, and, in spite of the more purely intellectual aspirations of Plotinus and the sceptical misgivings of Porphyry, ended in the miserable mysticism of Iamblichus. But there is another and a nobler exhibition of the conviction that there is a real antagonism between mind and matter, spirit and flesh—between a higher and a lower nature in man: and this also exhibited itself in the decline of Greek philosophy. When the judgment is stronger than the imagination, when the common sense of a mind thoroughly awake finds the proper result of the internal conflict in a discharge of practical duties, the intellectual faculties do not wing their flight to the dream-land of fancy, or seek to create opposing armies of fiends and angels to represent the battle between passion and reason.¹ It is sufficient for such men to recognize the divine oracle that

¹ It is a singular proof of the firm establishment of this dualistic phraseology in the modern European mind, when we find a poet like Coleridge substituting it for the commoner expression that the god of joy himself goes mad and contributes to the destruction of a house doomed to perish. We refer to his translation of the lines in Schiller's *Piccolomini*, act III. sc. 9 *ad fin.*:

Blind-wuthend schleudert selbst der Gott der Freude
Den Pechkranz in das brennende Gebäude,

which he renders (with an apology):

And fiends and angels mingling in their fury
Sling fire-brands on the burning edifice:

and which Hermann translates (*Opusc.* V. 357):

αὐτὴ δ' ἀμερθεῖς' ὄμματ' οἰστροπλήξ χαρὰ
πέυκην φλεγείσῃ λυσσάδ' ἐμβάλλει στέγγι.

speaks in the still small voice of conscience, and to obey the instinctive monitor which declares that virtue is to be chosen and vice to be disallowed, each on its own account. Such persons adopt their inherited religion, as interpreted by the conscience, without forming any theories respecting its origin and relations; their profession runs in the words of the old dramatist:¹

‘We serve the gods, whate’er those gods may be.’

And if, with this previous discipline, they fall under the influence of Christianity, they adopt its precepts as a rule of life, intended, as its chief teachers are careful to announce, to harmonize with the sense of right and wrong naturally implanted in man. While the fanciful Orientalist inevitably falls into heresy, the disciple of conscience is prepared beforehand for an adoption of the primitive and apostolic faith, to which he is opposed only because it is presented to him in connexion with an Eastern dualism and dæmonology to which his reason objects. As long as he is liable to confuse Christianity with all else that claims an Oriental origin, a philosopher of the class which we are describing will, like Seneca’s brother at Corinth, ‘care for none of these things.’ But when he can regard the true faith as the established religion of the West, he readily brings his scholastic artillery to reinforce the batteries of orthodoxy.

The first representatives of the school of philosophy which held these simpler views of the obligations of conscience were the later Stoics, who owed their system mainly and immediately to the teaching of Epictetus.

§ 2. We have already mentioned that Epictetus does not himself belong to the literature of Greece, having left nothing in writing, and that we are indebted to Arrian for a knowledge of his doctrines. FLAVIUS ARRIANUS was born at Nicomedeia in Bithynia towards the end of the first century of our æra.²

¹ Eurip. *Orestes*, 412 :

δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅτι ποτ’ εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί.

To much the same effect we have the fragments from the *Melanippe sapiens* of the same poet, quoted by Lucian, *Jupiter Tragedus*, 41 :

Ζεὺς ὅστις ὁ Ζεὺς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδα πλὴν λόγῳ
κλύων.

² What is known of Arrian’s life is fully discussed by Dodwell in his *Dissertatio*

He was both a Roman and an Athenian citizen. In the former capacity he filled more than one important magistracy. Hadrian, who had learned to estimate his worth from meeting him at Athens about A.D. 124, promoted him to the government of Cappadocia. This office he attained in A.D. 136, and while holding it distinguished himself by the skill and courage with which he defeated the invading Alani.¹ He was raised to the consular rank by Antoninus Pius in A.D. 146. The remainder of his life was spent in dignified retirement, ostensibly as priest of Ceres and Proserpine in his native city,² but really as a literary man engaged in the composition of philosophical and historical works. He died at an advanced age in the reign of M. Aurelius.³

Arrian had imagined a complete parallel between himself and Xenophon, and received a surname⁴ from his professed imitation of that Attic writer.⁵ His early acquaintance with Epictetus he compared with the relation between Socrates and Xenophon, and he published the lectures and conversations of his master just as Xenophon had compiled the memorials of the teaching of Socrates. His military successes against the barbarians in Asia entitled him to vie with Xenophon as a describer of battles, and his *Anabasis* of Alexander the Great imitates the style of the work from which it borrows its title. And he has even entered into competition with his model on the minor subject of the chase, having written a book with the same title as Xenophon's *Κυνηγετικός*.

Reserving to the following chapter our remarks on Arrian's historical works, we must here speak of him as the interpreter and representative of Epictetus. Besides a life of that philosopher which is lost,⁶ Arrian compiled 'the lectures or philosophical dissertations of Epictetus' (*διατριβαὶ Ἐπικτήτου*) in eight books,

de citate Epicteti atque Arriani, reprinted in Hoffmann's edition of the *Periplus*, Lipsiæ, 1842, pp. XXXIII. sqq.

¹ Dion Cassius, LXIX. 15. Suidas tells, s.v. *Δίων*, that this historian wrote a biography of Arrian.

² Phot. *Cod.* XCIII.

³ Suidas, s.v., who quotes Heliconius.

⁴ Photius, *Cod.* LVIII: *ἐπωνόμαζον δὲ αὐτὸν Ξενοφῶντα νέον*. Suidas, s.v.: *Ἀρριανὸς ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς νέος Ξενοφῶν*.

⁵ Phot. u.s.: *ισχνὸς τὴν φράσει ἐστὶ καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς μιμητὴς Ξενοφῶντος*.

⁶ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 89.

of which four have come down to our time; 'the familiar discourses of Epictetus' (ὁμιλίας Ἐπικτήτου) in twelve books, of which we have only some fragments; and 'the manual of Epictetus' (ἐγχειρίδιον Ἐπικτήτου), being a practical compendium of the Stoic doctrines.

In the first of these works, Arrian, as he tells us in his preface, is careful to give the very words of his master,¹ and he expressly disclaims any intention to improve the style, which Epictetus himself had regarded as quite a secondary matter.² There is no particular method in the arrangement of the topics. They are sometimes introduced abruptly, in the words of the speaker, with or without the addition of 'he said' (φησὶν, ἔφη), or 'he asked' (ῥώτησεν); sometimes an interlocutor is introduced, as in the memoirs of Socrates, to furnish the occasion of the remarks which follow, thus: 'A certain man of rank having come to him and questioned him on certain particulars, he asked if he had children and a wife;'³ or: 'when some one was advising with him, how he should persuade his brother not to be ill-natured, he said, philosophy does not promise that it will supply man with any thing from without.'⁴ The style is throughout simple and energetic, and there is an air of genuineness about it.

The 'Manual' has excited much attention on the part both of heathens and Christians. Simplicius wrote a commentary on it in the middle of the sixth century; and two Christians, St. Nilus and another whose name is not known, accommodated it by slight alterations to the use of Christian schools. Since the revival of letters it has often been reprinted as a handbook for the young,⁵ and in the last century two almost contemporary attempts were made to express its maxims in verse, the one being in Latin hexameters after the model of Horace,⁶

¹ Arrianus, *Epist. ad Gell.* § 2: ὅσα δὲ ἤκουον αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, ταῦτα αὐτὰ ἐπειράθην αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασιν ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν γραψάμενος ὑπομνήματα εἰς ὕστερον ἐμαντῶ διαφυλάξαι.

² *Ibid.* § 5.

³ *Dissert.* I. 11.

⁴ *Ibid.* I 15.

⁵ The first Latin translation was made by Angelo Poliziano, and published with his celebrated version of Herodian, *Romæ*, 1493.

⁶ Epicteti *Enchiridion*, Latinis versibus adumbratum per Edvardum Ivie, A.M. Æd. Christ. alumn. ed. OI. Oxon. 1723.

and the other in English heroics of the true didactic pattern.¹

The philosophy of Epictetus, as it is expounded to us by Arrian, is recommended by its extreme distinctness and simplicity. It is regarded as a practical rule of life, deriving its precepts from right reason and the conscience or moral will. Physical science, which leads to unprofitable speculation, and dialectics, which merely cultivate the intellectual faculties, are comparatively neglected. The only problem, which appears to Epictetus as really important, is that which is suggested by ethics. And the solution is found in the rule that we must mortify our irrational desires. 'Sustain and abstain' (ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου)² is his primary precept; bear the evils of life and mortify your corrupt affections. We are but as spectators in this outer world; its outward circumstances are not in our power; but we are rulers in the world within: we can regulate our desires, our impulses, and our fears: our will is our own; and if we exercise it in accordance with the dictates of conscience we shall be independent of all that is without ourselves.³ He does not however recommend selfish isolation, or the insensibility of a statue; but enjoins a due regard for the relations, both natural and adscititious (τὰς σχέσεις τὰς φυσικὰς καὶ ἐπιθέτους), which bind men together as worshippers of the same gods, as sons, brothers, parents, or fellow-citizens.⁴ The religion of

¹ Epicteti *Enchiridion*. The Morals of Epictetus made English in a poetical paraphrase, by Ellis Walker, M.A., London, 1716.

² Aul. Gellius, *N. A.* XVII. 19. Ellis Walker remarks (*life of Epictetus*, prefixed to his paraphrase): 'Epictetus would have all philosophy to consist in continence and patience; for which reason he had always those two words in his mouth, *bear* and *forbear*, words which in Greek have a peculiar elegance, there being but the difference of a single letter between them.'

³ The *Enchiridion* begins with an enforcement of these principles, which may be given in Mr. Ivie's hexameters, as a specimen of that attempt:

Res rebus quantum distant! sunt quæ penes ipsos
Nos positæ nostrâ poterunt ratione moveri;
Utpote sensa animi, desideriumque odiumque, et
Cetera de genere hoc. Et quod parere recusat
Arbitriis nostris, genus intractabile rerum;
Huc famam refer, huc fasces, sellasque curules,
Corpus item et nummos hâc rite in classe repōnas.

⁴ *Dissert.* III. 2, § 4.

Epictetus is that of the old heathen world;¹ but he despises augury,² and does not accept the doctrine of future punishments in Tartarus.³ His religion like his morality is strictly practical. He asserts the providence of the supreme Being, and his constant beneficence.⁴ He will not allow that God can be the cause of any thing that is evil.⁵ In the outer world there are no real evils which can be attributed to the governor of the universe, and within ourselves not only have we a portion of the divine essence, which illuminates our hearts,⁶ but we may always implore the divine aid to support and strengthen us in our moments of passionate disturbance, just as the Dioscuri are invoked in the tempest at sea.⁷

The improved form of Stoic morality and religion, thus set forth by the slave of a freedman, found, before it sank into oblivion, a more dignified expounder than even the procurator and general who had vindicated the power of Rome in Cappadocia. An emperor, whose private virtues gave a dying lustre to the happy period extending from the accession of Nerva to that of Commodus, not only condescended to lecture his subjects at Rome on the principles of Epictetus, but has left us his private meditations composed in the midst of a camp, and exhibiting the serenity of a mind, which has made itself independent of outward circumstances and of the passions warring within. MARCUS AURELIUS VERUS, who, after his adoption by Antoninus Pius, was called M. ÆLIUS AURELIUS VERUS ANTONINUS, was emperor of Rome from A.D. 169 to A.D. 180, when he died at Vienna. His life belongs to the history of Rome. Of the public events of his reign it is only necessary to mention here, as an illustration of his literary character, the persecutions of the Christians which he authorised, and which have made his government one of the most disastrous in the history of the new religion. It has been remarked that these persecutions ‘synchronise exactly with the period of the breaking out of the Marcomannic war, which seems to have

¹ *Man.* XXXI. 5.

² *Man.* XXXII. 3; *Diss.* II. 7.

³ *Diss.* III. 13, § 15.

⁴ *Man.* XXXI. § 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* § 2.

⁶ *Diss.* I. 14, § 6.

⁷ *Diss.* II. 18, § 29: τοῦ θεοῦ μέμνησο, ἐκείνων ἐπικαλοῦ βοήθην καὶ παραστάτην, ὥς τοὺς Διοσκόρους ἐν χειμῶνι οἱ πλείοντες.

alarmed the whole empire and the emperor himself into a paroxysm of returning piety to their gods, of which the Christians were the victims.¹ It was a part of the religious philosophy, which M. Aurelius professed, to make the old religion of his country the ostensible basis of his faith and to regard with suspicion the oriental systems, of which Christianity in its gnostic forms was regarded as a mischievous example. Nor can it be considered inconsistent with the morality of conscientiousness, when a man, who finds the rule of duty within himself, clings to an inherited and established worship. Aurelius claimed descent from Numa, and may have remembered the tradition recorded by Livy² that great disasters befel the successor of that mythical king from his neglect of the rites of religion, which the Sabine had established, and that Numa's grandson Ancus Martius considered it one of his first duties on ascending the throne to rectify the ceremonial errors of his predecessor. At any rate, he would scarcely disconnect the greatness of Rome, which he was so anxious to maintain, from the old faith of the country, which admitted of adaptation to his ethical theory. The persecutions then, which he sanctioned, were only the result of a feeling which has produced precisely the same effects on Jews and Christians, and which, though always unjustifiable, was certainly less criminal in a case like his, than where it influences the conduct of the disciples of our faith. It is very probable that Marcus was quite unaware of the resemblance between many of his own maxims and those of the Sermon on the Mount.³

The meditations of M. Aurelius are contained in twelve books, entitled Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου αὐτοκράτορος τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν βιβλία ιβ'. These reflections, which were most elaborately edited by one of our best scholars and divines in the seventeenth century,⁴ do not profess to be methodically arranged. They are

¹ Milman on Gibbon, c. XVI. II. p. 257, ed. W. Smith.

² Liv. I. cc. 31, 32.

³ See the passages cited in Gataker's *Index Locorum Sacre Scripturæ*.

⁴ *Marci Antonini Imperatoris de rebus suis: studio operaque Thomæ Gatakeri*, republished in *Thomæ Gatakeri Opera Critica*. Traj. ad Rhen. 1698. The commentaries are full of learning and information, and may be read with profit, although the student will be constantly annoyed by the writer's affectation in omitting the *u* after *q*.

detached maxims and reasonings, committed to paper as they occurred to the writer, or were suggested by circumstances. They contain more than one direct reference to Epictetus,¹ whose doctrines Aurelius had learned from his teacher Rusticus, and the spirit is quite that of the master of Arrian. Like Epictetus, but still more distinctly, the emperor objects to physical researches, and insists upon a devotion to our inner life.² The conscience, to whose voice he ever listens, is described as a *dæmon* or god within us;³ but he has no superstitious machinery which would imply its independent existence; he clearly understands by it the enlightened reason; he identifies it with that higher self to which he bids us retire, collect ourselves, and look within; and he expressly intimates that the *dæmon* is liable to dissolution like the body in which it resides.⁴ We are not to understand from this phraseology, or from his exhortation to man to simplify himself (*ἀπλῶσον σεαυτόν*),⁵ that he approximated to the Neo-Platonists either in their mysticism or in their ascetic morality. Although adopting, with a sort of practical conservatism, the established religion of the state, which M. Aurelius, as the head of the empire, felt himself especially bound to maintain, the later Stoics attached no real importance to its ceremonies, and formally undervalued all that pretended to supernatural in its prophetic department. It was to them, like everything else, subordinated to the practical end of life. And for the same reason they shrank from the speculations of the Platonists into the nature and origin of things,

¹ VII. 19, V. 34, 36, and especially I. 7, where the *ὑπομνήματα* referred to are probably a work by Arrian, of which the *Enchiridion* is an abridgment; cf. Renouvier, *Manuel de Philosophie Ancienne*, II. p. 299.

² VII. 28: *εἰς αὐτὸν συνειλοῦ. φύσιν ἔχει τὸ λογικὸν ἡγεμονικὸν ἐαυτῷ ἀρκείσθαι δικαιοπραγοῦντι καὶ παρ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο γαλήνην ἔχοντι.*

³ II. 13, III. 3, 6, 7, 12, 16, V. 27, XII. 3, 19, 26. 'What is M. Aurelius' cardinal doctrine? That there is a god within him, a Word, a Logos, which *has hold of him*, and who is his teacher and guardian; that over and above his body and his soul, he has a reason which is capable of *hearing that Divine Word, and obeying the monitions of that god*' (Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 96). Thus far M. Aurelius agrees with Plutarch, but he does not, with him, adopt the *ἀντιστοιχία* of oriental dualism, and adopt an Evil Being as well.

⁴ IV. 21.

⁵ IV. 26: *σεαυτὸν μὴ τάρασσε· ἀπλῶσον σεαυτόν.* VII. 31: *φαίδρυνον σεαυτὸν ἀπλότῃτι.* X. 9: *πότε γὰρ ἀπλότῃτος ἀπολαύσεις;*

and had no more sympathy with the thaumaturgy of the heathen Asiatics than with the exclusive pretensions of Christianity, which they placed in the same class. But there could not be two more entirely different tendencies than those which led M. Aurelius to adopt the principles of Epictetus, and those which, long afterwards, induced Julian to patronize the superstitious impostures of Iamblichus.

§ 3. A conscientious opposition to bigoted superstition and sacerdotal or philosophical imposture is not generally, or indeed naturally, conducted in a grave and reverential spirit. Whether fanciful theories and pretentious thaumaturgy are regarded as manifestations of silly credulity or as proofs of intentional dishonesty, they are as likely to provoke contempt as to excite indignation; and, according to the temperament of the conscientious objector, he will adopt the one form of antagonism in preference to the other. But the most genuine and open attacks on false religion and philosophy proceed from those who combine a strong sense of right and wrong with a constitutional vivacity. One of the wisest and wittiest of our modern satirists¹ has well expressed this fact in the language of phrenology, when he says that an union of the organs of conscientiousness and gaiety disqualifies a man for the profession of priesthood. A genuine love of truth produces a sincere abhorrence of falsehood and simulated beliefs; and a lively sense of the ludicrous not only creates the feeling of contempt, but leads to its frank and open expression. When the latter endowment is purely selfish, and unsupported by the strong moral sense which would make a man, if necessary, a martyr for the truth, the opponent of superstitious falsehood may do good in his generation, but it will be only in the way of destroying the fabric of error; he will not become a preacher of the opposite truth; he will not re-edify that which he has pulled down. Such a man was Voltaire in the eighteenth century. He was conscious that he had the truth, at least partially, on his side: but it was not for the truth alone, or even principally, that he fought: it was to gain the supremacy, to which his talents entitled him, by an adherence to what had become the winning side of public

¹ W. M. Thackeray, *The Newcomes*, vol. I. p. 82.

opinion. He had, as his ablest and fairest critic¹ has remarked, 'a little love of finding truth, with a great love of making proselytes.' And the result was, that, though he did some good in battering down an hypothesis which had been substituted for the true faith, he has neither damaged the faith itself, nor has he contributed at all to re-establish it on its true and eternal basis. Greek literature presents us with a genius similar to Voltaire at the very period which we are discussing. With powers both of rhetoric and ridicule quite equal to those of the world-renowned Frenchman, Lucian combined a more sincere, conscientious, and courageous love of the truth for its own sake. But the results of his efforts against the false religion and false philosophy of his day were, like those of Voltaire's ridicule, merely negative. He gave the death-blow to declining heathenism, or rather paved the way for its exit from the world; and he did this from a sincere contempt for falsehood. But, unfortunately, he had nothing tangible that he could substitute for what he destroyed. He had never known, or had never been led to embrace, the religion for which Polycarp suffered martyrdom about the time of his settlement in Greece; and his works remain as an adequate exposure of the absurdities of the old Greek mythology, of the frantic folly of Peregrinus, of the gross dishonesty of Alexander, and of the abominations of oriental superstition, without giving us a resting-place for faith and conscience on the ground which is strewn with the ruins of these prostrate fabrics of error.

LUCIANUS, or LYCINUS, was, as he calls himself,² a Syrian or Assyrian. His native place was Samosata,³ the capital of Commagene, situated on the right or western bank of the Euphrates,⁴ and therefore on the very borders of Mesopotamia. The year of his birth is not distinctly stated, but it may be assigned inferentially to A.D. 125.⁵ For he tells us⁶ he was forty years

¹ See Carlyle's *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. II. p. 179.

² *Adv. Indoct.* 19: καὶ μὴν ὅσα γε κάμει Σύρον ὄντα εἰδέναι. *Scytha*, 9: τοὺς Σύρους ἡμᾶς. *Bis accusatus*, 27: καὶ μονονουχὶ κἀνδυν ἐνδευκότα ἐς τὸν Ἀσσύριον τρέπον. *De Syriâ deâ.* 1: γράφω δὲ Ἀσσύριος εἶναι.

³ *De Histor. Conscrib.* 24: τὴν ἐμὴν πατρίδα τὰ Σαμῶσατα.

⁴ *Piscator*, 19: πατρὶς δὲ τίς; Σύρος, ὃ φιλοσοφία, τῶν Ἐπενφρατίδων.

⁵ We adopt the arguments of G. Wetzlar, *De ætate, vitâ scriptisque Luciani Samosatensis*, Marburgi, 1834.

⁶ *Bis accus.* 32; *Hermot.* 13.

old when he gave up rhetoric and took to philosophy. This must have been at the time when he went to Greece with Peregrinus at the commencement of Ol. 236, *i.e.* A.D. 165. Again, on his journey homewards before this, he speaks of the war with the Parthians, which lasted from A.D. 162 to A.D. 165, as an almost contemporary event.¹ Again, he tells us that he had attended the Olympic games three times before Ol. 236,² and that his first attendance there was when he was twenty years old.³ Now he went to Gaul when he was twenty-seven, and lived there ten years.⁴ Moreover, he was not at Olympia at the festival immediately before the death of Peregrinus;⁵ and it is not likely that he came back from Gaul in the first year of his residence there. The only years, then, when he could have attended the games were—in 165, when he was forty; in 157, when he was thirty-two (*i.e.* in the middle of his residence in Gaul); in 149, when he was twenty-four; and in 145, when he was twenty.

Lucian was born of humble parentage. His father's trade is unknown, but it was not any handicraft (*βάνανσός τις τέχνη*), otherwise he would have been brought up to it, according to the usual practice; and his mother's family were hereditary sculptors (*λιθοξόοι*).⁶ Having shown some boyish skill in modelling wax figures of cows and horses, and even of men,⁷ he was sent to learn the art of statuary under his uncle. He was then fifteen,⁸ and had been some time at school. Fortunately for literature, he broke the first piece of marble which was entrusted to him, received a beating for his carelessness from the irascible uncle, and went home weeping to show his weals, and to charge his teacher not only with cruelty, but even with

¹ *De Histor. Conscrib.* 14: ἐγὼ δ' οὖν καὶ διηγήσομαι ὅποσα μέμνημαι ἑναγχοῦς ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ συγγραφέων τινῶν, καὶ νῆ Δία ἐν Ἀχαΐᾳ πρῶν ἀκούσας τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον πόλεμον διηγουμένων. Cf. C. F. Hermann, *ad Luc. de hist. conscrib.* pp. XV—XVII. 98—100.

² *De morte Peregrini*, 35: καὶ δὴ τὰ μὲν Ὀλύμπια τέλος εἶχε, κάλλιστα Ὀλυμπίων γενόμενα, ὧν ἐγὼ εἶδον, τετράκις ἤδη ὄρων.

³ *Hermot.* 13. Cf. c. 2.

⁴ He was twenty-five when he arrived in Italy (*Bis accus.* 27; *Herod.* s. *Æt.* 5) and probably lived there about two years; see Wetzlar, p. 44.

⁵ *De morte Peregr.* 20.

⁶ *Somn. Luc.* 7.

⁷ *Ibid.* 2.

⁸ *i.e.* πρόσηβος, *Somn.* c. 1.

a mean jealousy of his own talents.¹ This incident put an end to his practice of the fine arts; and nothing was left him but to take up literature as a profession. In the midst of poverty, he applied himself to the studies which were regarded as the necessary preliminaries for the business of a sophist.² While still a mere youth, speaking a kind of barbarous *patois* instead of Greek, and almost showing his origin by an Assyrian costume,³ he made a pilgrimage to the rhetorical schools of Ionia, quite in the spirit of a modern German apprentice. Having in this way picked up a good deal of knowledge, he extended his wanderings to Greece, where, he tells us, he arrived in his twentieth year, and became acquainted with the Platonic philosopher Nigrinus. After this he practised as an advocate at Antioch,⁴ and obtained such reputation by his ability as a speaker in the law courts⁵ that he felt himself entitled to undertake the profession of a travelling sophist, or show-orator, after the manner of Aristides. In this capacity, he visited Syria, Phœnicia, and Egypt, probably in the years 148, 149 A.D. We hear especially of his having been at Hierapolis,⁶ Byblus,⁷ Libanus,⁸ and Sidon,⁹ where he carefully inspected the seats of oriental superstitions. And the same curiosity was no doubt gratified in Egypt.¹⁰ If the dialogue called *the Loves* were genuine, we should infer from it that in A.D. 149 he set out again from Antioch,¹¹ but on this occasion for a prolonged western tour. At Rhodes, according to this authority, he joined his friends, Callicratides of Athens and Charicles of Corinth;¹² and at Cnidus he took the opportunity of seeing the celebrated temple of Venus,¹³ and here addressed his friends on the abuses of the passion of love among the Greeks. Whatever we may conclude as to the details of his journey, it is clear that he arrived at Rome in A.D. 150, his first business there being to find an

¹ *Ibid.* 3, 4.² *Ibid.* 18.³ *Bis accus.* 27 : βάρβαρον ἔτι τὴν φωνήν κ.τ.λ.⁴ Suidas, s.v. Λουκιανός : ἦν δὲ οὗτος τὸ πρὶν δικηγόρος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας.⁵ *Piscator*, 25 : ῥήτωρ γάρ τις ὡς φασιν ὦν ἀπολιπὼν τὰ δικαστήρια καὶ τὰς ἐν ἐκείνοις εὐδοκίμῃσεις, ὅποσον ἢ δευνότητος ἢ ἀκμῆς ἐπεπόριστο ἐν τοῖς λόγοις.⁶ *De Syria ded.* I. 10 sqq.⁷ *Ibid.* 6.⁸ *Ibid.* 9.⁹ *Ibid.* 4.¹⁰ *De luctu*, 21 ; *Pseudosoph.* 5 ; *Pseudolog.* 10. But he did not visit any other part of Libya : *Dipsad.* 6 : ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀνέβην τῆς Λιβύης τὸ παράπαν.¹¹ *Amor.* 6, 18.¹² *Ibid.* 9.¹³ *Ibid.* 11.

oculist, as one of his eyes was in a very bad condition.¹ At the same time, however, he fell in with a physician to open the eyes of his mind. His friend Nigrinus was at Rome, and almost persuaded him to pass at once from rhetoric to philosophy, as he did fifteen years afterwards.² The time, however, had not yet come: he had not yet made himself independent of the lucrative profession of sophist. Accordingly, after a stay of about two years in Italy, he passed on to Gaul in A.D. 152, in order to avail himself of an opening for a first-rate sophist which his friends told him he would find in that province.³ Here he made a profitable use of his abilities as a teacher of rhetoric and public lecturer for more than ten years. With the exception of his probable visit to the Olympic festival in A.D. 157, it seems likely that Gaul was his regular place of residence till A.D. 163; and he had earned so much money by his profession,⁴ that he was able to retire from it and devote the rest of his life to philosophy.⁵ He returned to the east through Macedonia, where he made a display of his rhetorical powers at Thessalonica;⁶ and travelling through Asia Minor, he reached Samosata in A.D. 164. Here he found his father still living,⁷ and removed him and his family to Greece,⁸ whither he followed them in A.D. 165. On his way, he turned aside to visit the impostor Alexander at Abonoteichos, afterwards Ionopolis in Cappadocia.⁹ Having previously interfered with a plan of this false prophet, and having by this and various other proceedings incurred his enmity, Lucian thought it advisable to obtain the protection of a guard of two soldiers;¹⁰ and this was the more necessary, as he had resolved to brave the charlatan in his own castle. He completed his tricks upon Alexander by inflicting such a bite upon his hand, when it was held out for the customary kiss, that the wound almost deprived him of the use of it.¹¹ Notwithstanding this injury, Alexander professed to be

¹ *Nigrin.* 2: τὸ γὰρ πάθος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ μᾶλλον ἐπετείνατο.

² *Nigrin.* 1. Cf. *Hermotim.* 24.

³ *Harmonid.* 3. Cf. *pro Merced. Conduct.* 15.

⁴ *Pro Merced. Cond.* 15; *Somn.* 11, 12; *Harmonid.* 4.

⁵ *Bis. accus.* 32; *Hermotim.* 13.

⁶ *Scyth.* 9; *Herod.* 7.

⁷ *Alexand.* 56; *Somn.* 9.

⁸ *Alexand.* 56.

⁹ *Ibid.* 58

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 55.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

reconciled to him, and, among other gifts, furnished him with a vessel and rowers to convey him to Amastris, an accommodation which Lucian very imprudently accepted.¹ When they were about half-way, he observed the master of the vessel in tears, and endeavouring to oppose the sailors in something that they wished to do. On inquiring, he found that Alexander had enjoined the crew to fling him overboard; but the old and respectable captain had sufficient influence with them to prevent this, and Lucian was landed at Ægialos with his companion Xenophon, whence he proceeded to Amastris with some ambassadors, who were bound to the court of Eupator, king of Bithynia.² Hence he travelled into Greece with Peregrinus Proteus, and was present when that profligate and crazy quack burned himself alive at Olympia.³ From the year A.D. 165, when this took place, till the latter years of his life, Lucian lived in great comfort and literary leisure at Athens.⁴ During the greater part of this period, he had given up the profession of a sophist, and was engaged in the study of philosophy, without, however, finding any system which he could even generally adopt.⁵ Perhaps he inclined most at one time to the tenets of the Epicureans,⁶ at another to the Pyrrhonian scepticism. When he was declining in years, about A.D. 196, the diminution of his means obliged him to betake himself once more to the employments of his younger days,⁷ and he delivered a few declamations, without, however, much effect; and he was glad at last to accept from the emperor Severus an honourable and lucrative appointment⁸ connected with the law-courts of Alexandria.⁹ Of

¹ *Ibid.* 56.

² *Ibid.* 57.

³ *De morte Peregrini*, c. 43.

⁴ E. Struve, *De Luciani ætate et vitâ*, spec. II: 'quamvis enim se Athenis vivere diserte nunquam eloquitur, tamen ubique ipsa id scripta testantur, illa inquam illius ætatis optima et pulcherrima, dialogi illi festivi et urbanitatis pleni, qui Athenis semper agunt, et omnes omnino Atticam spirant elegantiam, et quoscunque sibi æquales memorat, ut quibus aut consuetudine et familiaritate fuisset conjunctus, aut quorum mores vitamque bene perspexisset, illo ipso tempore Athenis vixisse notum est.'

⁵ *Piscator*, 11 sqq.

⁶ See the favourable expressions in his *Alexander*, 25, 47, 63.

⁷ *Herc.* 7, 8; *Bacch.* 6, 7.

⁸ *Pro Merc. Cond.* 12: καὶ ὁ μισθὸς οὐκ ἰδιωτικὸς ἀλλὰ παρὰ βασιλέως· οὐ μικρὸς οὐδὲ οὗτος, ἀλλὰ πολυτάλαντος.

⁹ From the description which he gives of his office (*pro Mer. Cond.* 1.1.) he

the date of his death we know nothing; it has been inferred from the poem called *Ocypus*, of which the *Tragopodagra* is a continuation,¹ that he suffered much at the end of his life from gout, which may have caused his death. Suidas says,² with a wonderful vehemence of bigotry, that he was torn to pieces by dogs because he raved against the truth and blasphemed the name of Christ: 'whence,' he adds, 'he paid an ample penalty in this life, and in the life to come he will inherit eternal fire with Satan.' This violence of language and atrocity of statement probably rest on no better foundation than some ecclesiastical tradition, suggested by the belief that Lucian wrote the *Philopatris*, and was a malignant enemy of the faith. But it has long been the opinion of critics that Lucian is not the author of *Philopatris*; and there is no reason to believe that he was more specially opposed to Christianity than he was generally to the forms of oriental superstition with which he had been led to class the history of our Saviour.

§ 4. Notwithstanding his real or supposed opposition to the Church, Lucian has been treated even by Christian writers with the respect due to his literary talents, which were of the highest order, and entitle him to a place by the side of the best classical authors. In addition to a few poems, no less than seventy-nine separate works have come down with his name.³ Of these, however, modern criticism has discarded a considerable number. The following tracts were undoubtedly not written by Lucian:

(a) *Philopatris, or the taught*, a dialogue between Tricphon, Critias, and Cleolaus, intended to cast discredit on Christianity.

seems to have been clerk and registrar of the supreme court. It devolved on him, *inter alia*, τὰς δίκας εἰσάγειν καὶ τάξιν αὐταῖς τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιτιθέναι καὶ τῶν πραττομένων καὶ λεγομένων ἀπαξαπνόντων ὑπομνήματα γράφεσθαι.

¹ Wetzlar, *u.s.* p. 56.

² κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐλύπησεν. He adds: εἰς γὰρ τὸν Πιερὲγγρινὸν βίον καθάπτεται τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν βλασφημεῖ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁ παμμίλαρος. On which Kiister remarks, that in the said treatise he calls our Saviour ἀνεσκολοπισμένον σοφιστήν. This is not the case. The words of Lucian (*De morte Peregrini*, c. II. p. 269, Lehmann) are: τὸν μέγαν ἐκείνον ἀνθρώπον τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα.

³ Bekker, in his edition of Lucian, *Berol.* 1853, has carefully arranged all the works of this author according to their internal connexion, as it appears to him. The arrangement differs considerably from the old and ordinary sequence of the treatises.

That this is not a genuine work of the great Lucian has been conclusively shown by Gesner,¹ who believes that it was written by a sophist of the same name known to have been a correspondent of Julian the Apostate.² Niebuhr has printed this tract at the end of Leo Diaconus, and supposes it to have been written under Nicephorus Phocas about A.D. 968.³

(b) *Charidemus, or on beauty*, is confidently rejected by Gesner and others on the evidences of the style.

(c) The dialogue between Socrates and Chærephon, entitled *Halcyon, or on metamorphosis*, is ascribed by Athenæus⁴ and Diogenes of Laerte⁵ to Leo the Academician; it was once attributed to Plato, and being thrust out of his works, has found, as a modern scholar well remarked, an unmerited asylum among those of Lucian.⁶

(d) It has been shown by Ranke⁷ that the essay *on long-lived men* was written by Phlegon of Tarsus, a sophist who flourished under Tiberius, and whose work furnished the materials for a similar and inferior treatise by a freedman of Hadrian, known as Phlegon of Tralles.

(e) The insignificant brochure entitled *Nero, or the digging through the Isthmus*, is generally rejected as quite unworthy of Lucian, and as showing no resemblance either to his character or his style. As we have already mentioned, it has been claimed for Philostratus,⁸ and printed as his work.

(f) Three eminent scholars, Küster, Gesner, and Heyne have agreed in rejecting the treatise *on astrology*. The fact that it is written in the Ionic dialect is a trivial argument, and would be

¹ *Dissertatio de ætate et auctore Philopatris*, Jenæ, 1714. Lips. 1730. Gotting. 1741, reprinted in Lehmann's *Lucian*, IX. pp. 635 sqq.

² *Juliani Epist.* XXXII. p. 404.

³ Niebuhr, *Præfat. ad Leon. Diacon.* p. 9. See also his essay *über das Alter der Dialogs Philopatris* in his *Kleine Schriften*, II. p. 73.

⁴ XI. p. 506 A.

⁵ III. 62.

⁶ C. F. Hermann, *allgem. Schulzeit.* 1832, no. 100: 'das elendeste Machwerk eines verunglückten Sokratikers, das, längst aus Plato's Werken ausgestossen, hier ein unverdientes Asyl gefunden hat, dessen wahrer Verfasser Leon bereits im Alterthume bekannt war.'

⁷ *Pollux et Lucianus* (Quedlinb. 1831), pp. 16—22.

⁸ By Kayser, *ad Philostr. Vit. Sophist.* pp. XXXIII. 123—130. That Philostratus wrote a work called Νέπων is stated by Suidas.

equally applicable to the book *on the Syrian Goddess*, which was clearly a work of Lucian's. But the absence of all the characteristics of Lucian is fatal to its pretensions.¹

(g) *Lucius, or the Ass*, is probably either the original or an abridgment of the Milesian tale by Lucius of Patrae,² which is so well known from its Latin imitation by Appuleius, a contemporary of Lucian; and it has perhaps been attributed to Lucian from the similarity of his name to that of the real author.

(h) The few pages entitled *Hippias, or the bath*, will not find many advocates among the admirers of Lucian, and they are properly obelized in the most recent editions.

(i) *Menippus, or the oracle of the dead*, seems to be the work of some imitator of Lucian,³ and is full of passages taken verbatim from his genuine works.⁴

(k) The *Cynic* takes a view of that sect more favourable than Lucian would have countenanced, and the tract was most likely written by some one to oppose Lucian's depreciation of the school.

(l) We concur with the majority of critics⁵ in the opinion that the *Loves*, with its odious arguments and low sophistic style, is not Lucian's, but may rather be referred to Aristænetus.

(m) If the *Images* really refer to the *Loves* in a well known passage,⁶ the former must also be abandoned together with the accompanying dialogue *in defence of the Images* (ὑπὲρ τῶν Εἰκόνων). They are both of them written in a style of rhetoric quite alien from that of Lucian, and the former indulges in gross flattery of a lady called Panthea, the wife or concubine of

¹ Heyne says (*Opusc. Acad.* II. p. 335): 'levissimæ auctoritatis est libellus de astrologiâ, nam etsi is inter Lucianeos habetur, Lucianum tamen auctorem nullo modo habere potes, si modo non plane sui dissimilis fuit Lucianus.'

² See Photius, *Cod.* CXXIX; J. P. Courier (*la Luciade ou l'Ane de Lucius de Patras*, Paris, 1828, preface p. X) maintains that this tract is the original.

³ According to Diogenes of Laërte (p. 162 D), Menippus wrote a Νεκυῖα, and Solanus has accordingly supposed that he is the author of the *Menippus* of Lucian.

⁴ The fifteenth c. is full of passages to be found in the *Dialogues of the Dead*.

⁵ The authenticity of *The Loves* is maintained by C. F. Hermann and Wetzlar, who account for its peculiarities by supposing that it was a juvenile production.

⁶ That relating to the young man who fell in love with the statue (*Amor.* 15; *Imag.* 5: τοῦτο μεντοι ἄλλως ἰστορεῖσθω).

the emperor,¹ to which the great satirist would hardly have condescended.

There are other works² besides these, the genuineness of which might be questioned, but the objections to them are more than balanced by other considerations.

The genuine writings of Lucian may be classified generally in accordance with the periods, into which his life is divided. It does not appear that he came forward as a writer before his visit to Italy in A.D. 150. One of his earliest works was his tract *on the Syrian Goddess*, written when he was fresh from the east, as appears among other things from his calling Deucalion by his Syrian name, which is disguised however under a very natural corruption of the text.³ The dialect is not the Attic in which he afterwards became such a master, but the Ionic, which he took up in imitation of Herodotus. From what he says in a short piece called *Herodotus, or Aetion*⁴ he seems to have regarded the style and dialect of the great historian as inimitably beautiful, and perhaps this was the reason why he afterwards abstained from any similar attempts. Many of his purely rhetorical works were undoubtedly composed in Gaul, as professional labours and specimens of his talents: such are the *Tyrannicide*, the first and second *Phalaris*, the *Encomium on the fly*, and the *Twice disinherited* (ἀποκηρυττόμενος). On his journey eastward in A.D. 163 he composed his *Harmónides*, *Scythian*, and *Herodotus*⁵ for recitation at Thessalonica and elsewhere. On his arrival at Samosata in A.D. 164 he recited his *Dream* or autobiography to a select circle of friends, in the form of a *προσλαλιά*⁶. But his principal works were

¹ *Imag.* 10, 11.

² For example, the treatise on *the Syrian Goddess*, the *Encomium of his country*, the *Eulogy of Demosthenes*, the *Pseudosophist*, the *Fugitives*, and even the *Nigrinus*.

³ He calls him a Scythian (Σκύθης), meaning Σικύθης, i. e. *Xisuthrus*; see Berosus, II. *apud Euseb. Chron.* I. c. 3; Syncell. *Chron.* pp. 30, 31. Cf. Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, I. p. 18.

⁴ I: 'Ηροδότου εἶθε μὲν καὶ τὰλλα μιμήσασθαι δυνατόν ἦν, οὐ πάντα φημὶ ὅσα προσῆν αὐτῷ—μεῖζον γὰρ εὐχῆς τοῦτό γε—ἀλλὰ κὰν ἐν ἐκ τῶν ἀπάντων, ὅλον ἢ κάλλος τῶν λόγων, ἢ ἁρμονίαν αὐτῶν, ἢ τὸ οἰκεῖον τῇ Ἰωνίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.

⁵ Cf. *Scyth.* 9; *Herod.* 7.

⁶ *Somm.* 18: οἷος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπαυελήλυθα. 'Unde recte colligitur,' says C. F. Hermann (*ad Luc. de Histor. Conscrip.* p. 178), 'declamationem illam a Luciano

published at Athens during his long residence there after A.D. 165. Soon after the death of Peregrinus he probably published his account of that event. The treatise entitled *How we ought to write history* (πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν) was written in A.D. 165;¹ that *On the false prophet Alexander* appears to have been composed after the death of M. Aurelius in A.D. 180;² and the *Teacher of rhetoricians* has been assigned to the reign of Commodus.³ In the earlier years of his Athenian life he must have composed the *Nigrinus*, the *Hermotimus*, the *Runaways* (δραπεταί), the *Twice accused*, *On those who keep company with the great for hire* (περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων), the *Sale of lives* (βίων πρᾶσις) and its sequel the *Fisherman*, or *the Philosophers come to life again* (ἀλιεύς ἡ ἀναβιοῦντες), the *Timon*, the *Ship* or *the Vows*, the *Pseudologistes* and the *Philopseudes*. All the dialogues of an Aristophanic character must be referred to this happy period in Lucian's career. Towards the end of his life, and shortly before he went to Egypt, he wrote the inferior pieces, such as the *Bacchus*, the *Hercules*, and the *Amber*. On taking service under the government he is supposed to have written his *Apology* with reference to his former treatise *On those who give their services for hire*,⁴ and his last work is perhaps the little tract, in which he excuses himself for a social inadvertence in saying *Good-bye* (ὑγίαιε) when he ought to have said *Good-morrow* (χαίρε). There are many of his works, such as the extravagant story of an imaginary voyage called the *True history*, of which the date of composition cannot be even approximately assigned. But we may say generally that the greater part of his rhetorical or sophistical works were written before A.D. 165, and that his critical, philo-

post itinera in patriam reduce ad cœtum civium Samosatensium habitam esse videri.'

¹ C. F. Hermann, *l.l.* pp. XIV—XVII.

² Cf. c. 48.

³ By Ranke (*Pollux et Lucianus*, Quedlinb. 1831), who has shown that under the faulty rhetorician Lucian intends to reflect on Julius Pollux, the author of the *Onomasticon*, who occupied the rhetorical chair at Athens in the reign of his pupil Commodus.

⁴ Wetzlar, p. 56: 'hoc igitur munus suscepturus, quasi palinodiam cecinit, ut qui semper antea conditionis suæ libertatem jactasset *apologíā*, pro *mercede conductis* scripta, quæ vero tantum abest ut aureo illi *de mercede conductis* libro comparari possit, ut vix umbram tanti nominis relictam nobis per imbecillam verborum et enthyematum captionem videamus.'

sophical, biographical, and purely humorous productions were composed after that time at Athens.

Besides the works included rightly or wrongly in the collection of his writings, Lucian was considered, by Poliziano and others, as the author of the celebrated *Epistles of Phalaris*; but there was little reason for this beyond the fact that two imaginary declamations of which Phalaris is the subject are found among his works.¹

Lucian is, on many accounts, one of the most interesting of men of letters in the declining period of Greek literary history. While he exhibits more of the classical spirit and style than any of his contemporaries, he approximates also, more nearly than any ancient writer, to the literary genius of modern times. Indeed, it has been impossible to overlook the resemblances between Lucian and some modern writers. We have already compared him with Voltaire. There are many points of resemblance between Lucian and Swift, whose *Gulliver's Travels* were of course suggested by Lucian's *True History*;² and it might not be difficult to estimate his influence, directly or indirectly, on such writers as Rabelais, Cervantes, Quevedo, Butler, and Sterne. Viewing him, which is our present business, with reference to his own age and to the literature of Greece, we must assign to him a position of the utmost importance, both with regard to the systems of religion and philosophy, to which he gave the death-blow, and with regard to the cultivation of a purer Greek style, which he vainly taught and exemplified.

In regard to religion and philosophy, Lucian assumed a sort of neutral, negative, and, in effect, destructive attitude. His strong conscientiousness and love of truth were combined with

¹ Φάλαρις δ, β'. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* l. II. c. X. § 1, and Valckenaer, *Præf. ad. Phal.* ed. 1777. p. V.

² Sir Walter Scott says (*Swift's Works*, vol. XII. p. 4): 'the general idea of the work is unquestionably borrowed from the *True History* of Lucian, a fictitious journey through imaginary countries, prefaced by an introduction in an exquisite vein of irony, upon the art of writing history. . . . From the *True History* of Lucian, Cyrano Bergerac took his idea of a *Journey to the Moon*, and Rabelais derived his yet more famous *Voyage of Pantagruel*. Swift has consulted both, as well as their common original, but is more particularly indebted to the work of Rabelais, which satirizes severely the various orders of the law and clergy of his time.'

a lively sense of the ludicrous, and a genial humour, which he never sought to control. He describes himself,¹ with no unjustifiable self-esteem, as a hater of imposture, jugglery, falsehood, and ostentation, and of the men who exhibit such qualities; and as a lover of truth, beauty, simplicity, and of all things naturally amiable.² He is quite aware that he is in a minority in this world.³ But he does not shrink from the contest; on the contrary, he enters fearlessly upon it, trusting to his proper allies *truth* and *freedom of speech*, and their associate, Menander's prologizer *Elenchus*, the god of confutation, 'not the least distinguished of those who have appeared on the stage; hateful to those alone who fear his tongue, knowing all things, and plainly and frankly disclosing all he knows.'⁴ 'I shall be obliged,' he says,⁵ 'to make war with no ordinary monsters, but with impostors, hard to be convinced, and always providing themselves with some subterfuge, so that *Elenchus* is necessary for me.' For his want of faith and reverence in regard to the old mythology of Greece he had a sufficient warranty in Aristophanes, whose tone he adopts in speaking of the Olympian deities; his personal acquaintance with the superstitions of Syria and Asia Minor, and with the false prophets and magicians of those districts, had inspired him with a general hatred of Orientalism with its dæmonologies and thaumaturgies. On whichever side, then, he turned his eyes he found no religion on which he could depend: and he had come to the conclusion that what was called religion was only the offspring of men's hopes and fears, which priestcraft had converted into a means of making money. Having lived in Antioch, where the Chris-

¹ *Piscator*, 20: μισαλάδων εἰμὶ καὶ μισογόης καὶ μισοψευδῆς καὶ μισότυφος καὶ μισῶ πᾶν τὸ τοιουτῶδες εἶδος μιαρῶν ἀνθρώπων. πάνν δὲ πολλοὶ εἰσιν, ὡς οἶσθα.

² *Ibid.*: φιλαλήθης τε γὰρ καὶ φιλόκαλος καὶ φιλαπλοϊκὸς καὶ ὅσα τῷ φιλεῖσθαι ξυγγενῇ.

³ *Ibid.*: πλὴν ἀλλ' ὀλίγοι πάνν ταύτης ἄξιοι τῆς τέχνης, οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τῇ ἐναντίᾳ ταττόμενοι καὶ τῷ μῦσει οἰκειότεροι πεντακισμύριοι.

⁴ *Pseudologista*, 4: μᾶλλον δὲ παρακλητέος ἡμῖν τῶν Μενάνδρου προλόγων εἰς, ὁ Ἐλεγχος, φίλος Ἀληθείᾳ καὶ Παρρησίᾳ, θεὸς οὐχ ὁ ἀσημύτατος τῶν ἐπὶ σκηνὴν ἀναβαινόντων, μόνοις ὑμῖν ἐχθροῖς τοῖς δεδιόσι τὴν γλῶτταν αὐτοῦ, πάντα καὶ εἰδότες καὶ σαφῶς διεξιόντος ὅποσα ὑμῖν σύνοιδε.

⁵ *Piscator*, 17: οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τυχοῦσι θηρίοις προσπολεμῆσαι δεήσει με, ἀλλ' ἀλαξῶσιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ δυσελέγκτοις, αἱ τινὰς ἀποφυγὰς εὕρισκομένοις, ὥστε ἀναγκαῖος ὁ Ἐλεγχος.

tians first obtained their distinctive name, he must have become acquainted in some measure with the doctrines of revelation; but he was too much occupied to study the subject thoroughly: the greater part of his life was spent in Gaul or at Athens, where he could not, at that time, have had many opportunities of becoming interested in Christianity; it seems clear that he regarded it as only one of the Oriental superstitions which he had learned to despise; and the voluntary death of the quondam Christian, Peregrinus Protus, which he had witnessed with his own eyes, would not incline him towards a faith which rested for its main fact on the sacrifice of its Founder. His friend Celsus, the Epicurean, to whom he dedicates the account of the false prophet Alexander,¹ and who had written against magic,² is supposed to have been the opponent of Christianity whom Origen answered.³ If so, Lucian's associates were not likely to facilitate his conversion. With regard to philosophy, he was equally opposed to the different sects, considered separately, and to the growing syncretism which was afterwards developed by the Neo-Platonists. He had devoted himself professedly to the study of philosophy after his settlement at Athens in A.D. 165, and had a great esteem for the philosophers Nigrinus, Demonax, and Sostratus, on whom he wrote essays or biographies, that on Sostratus being unfortunately lost. But he did not adopt their Platonism or modified Cynicism. And though he speaks in high terms of Epicurus,⁴ and perhaps inclined to his doctrines more than to any other, he sells him in his *Auction of Lives* for two minæ only,⁵ while he allows twelve minæ for the Stoic,⁶ twenty minæ for the Peripatetic,⁷ and two talents for the Platonist.⁸ And in the

¹ He praises him (*Alexand.* c. 61) for his wisdom, love of truth, his gentleness, moderation, serenity of mind, and cleverness.

² *Alexand.* 21: καὶ μάλιστα σοῦ ἐν οἷς κατὰ Μάγων συνέγραψας καλλίστοις τε ἅμα καὶ ὠφελιμωτάτοις συγγράμμασι καὶ δυναμένοις σωφρονίζειν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἱκανὰ παραθεμένου καὶ πολλῷ τούτων πλείονα.

³ It is not certain that the friend of Lucian and the object of Origen's apologetics were one and the same person. But the balance of probability is in favour of the identification: see C. G. Jacob, *ad Luc. Alex.* p. 3; J. F. Fenger, *De Celso Christianorum adversario Epicureo*, Havniæ, 1828; Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, I. p. 325.

⁴ *Alexand.* 17, 47; *Vera Hist.* 18.

⁵ *Vitar. Auct.* 19.

⁶ *Ibid.* 25.

⁷ *Ibid.* 26.

⁸ *Ibid.* 18.

Fisherman he represents himself in antagonism to all the philosophers. In fact, he repudiated all dogmatism, and all reliance on systems of religion or philosophy; and though the mere fact of his quoting Alexander's imputation on his moral character shows that he was irreproachable in his conduct,¹ he owns that he was 'incontinent of laughter' (ἀκράτης γέλωτος),² and he certainly indulged in his taste for merriment without paying much regard to the traditional beliefs or conventional opinions of his contemporaries. Men will judge Lucian and other jokers of jokes according to their own temperaments. To some his fondness for dancing and his love of all that was cheerful in nature and art will appear as reprehensible as his uncontrolled mirth. But we have the best authority for saying that in these cases 'wisdom is justified of all her children,' and we are not ourselves indisposed to believe that when conscientiousness and gaiety combined show their effects in honesty and plain-spokenness and open contempt of gloomy superstition, the *Parrhesiades*, as Lucian justly calls himself,³ is doing a good work in his generation. We are at least sure, that however little he intended it, the inimitable humour of Lucian did much to clear away the foundations of the prostrate temple of error, and so to open a space for the solid basement of our Church.⁴

The literary merits and services of Lucian have met with more general recognition than his attacks on superstition and imposture. Even his most bitter enemies, among the bigots whom he attacked or ridiculed, have admitted and admired his eminent abilities as a writer of dialogues; and in his skilful imitation of the genuine Attic style, one almost forgets that he was a Syrian who wrote in the age of the Antonines.⁵ If we would appreciate Lucian's Greek style, we must consider the difficulties under which it was formed. Independently of the disadvantage of being born in a humble station at Samosata on

¹ *Alexand.* 54.

² *Pseudologista*, 7. Cf. the advice which he makes Tiresias give to Menippus : τοῦτο μόνον ἐξ ἅπαντος θηράσῃ ὅπως τὸ παρὸν εὖ θέμενος παραδράμῃς γελῶν τὰ πολλὰ καὶ περὶ μὴδὲν ἐσπουδακῶς (*Menipp.* 21).

³ *Piscator*, 25.

⁴ See Eichstadt's essay 'Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare religionem Christianam voluerit,' in Lehmann's *Prolegomena*, pp. LXXV. sqq.

⁵ See Photius, *Cod.* CXXVIII.

the Euphrates, Lucian lived at a time when Greek style was growing more and more corrupt, and when even the professed rhetoricians allowed themselves an unlimited indulgence in solecisms. It was only by his natural taste and good sense that Lucian was led to a careful study of the old classical models, which were neglected at Athens and Rome; and he examined them not only with the genial sympathies of a true scholar, but with the minute accuracy of a genuine critic. There is no point too trivial for his attention, no question of style or grammar which he would intentionally neglect. The principal rhetoricians of the day, Julius Pollux and Favorinus, are attacked in his *Teacher of Rhetoricians* and his *Eunuch*, and in a piece called the *Pseudologistes*, or 'false reasoner,' he lashes most unmercifully one of his personal antagonists. The *Suit of the Vowels* shows his careful attention to orthography and grammar. And his *Lexiphanes* and *Pseudosophistes* taunt the rhetoricians of the day with their indiscriminate use of archaisms and new-fangled expressions. His rule, that one should sacrifice most of all to the graces and to perspicuity,¹ is fully exemplified in his own writings; he is not, like those whom he censures, a manufacturer of dolls painted in bright colours on the outside, but merely fragile earth within;² he has made the old Attic style his own by thinking in it, and has not only given precepts to others but shown that they are capable of realization. As a writer of pure and elegant Greek, which was neither vernacular with him, nor spoken and written by the most highly educated men of the day—as a humorist whose gaiety and fancy are inexhaustible—as an honest hater of shams and dishonest bigotry—as an educational reformer, whose exertions were not the less praiseworthy because they were not perfectly successful, Lucian of Samosata stands forth in favourable contrast to all the so-called sophists of his age, and we are among the number of those who think that his merits can hardly be over-estimated.³

¹ *Lexiph.* c. 23: μάλιστα δὲ χάρισι καὶ σαφηνείᾳ θύε, ὧν πάμπολυ λίαν νῦν ἀπολέλειψο.

² *Ib.* c. 22: κεχρωσμένος μὲν τῇ μίλτῳ καὶ τῷ κυανῷ, τὸ δ' ἐνδοθεν πηλινὸς τε καὶ εὐθρυπτος ὢν.

³ Gibbon (I. 195, ed. W. Smith) calls him justly 'the inimitable Lucian,' but

§ 5. Without any pretensions to the humour of Lucian or his versatile talents, Longinus, who flourished in the following century, occupies a similar position, both as an opponent of fanciful philosophy, and as a sound and sensible critic.

DIONYSIUS CASSIUS LONGINUS was of Syrian extraction, but neither his birth-place nor the year of his birth is distinctly stated.¹ As he was the teacher of Porphyry, who was born in A.D. 233, he was probably at least twenty years his senior, and he is not stated to have been a very old man at his death in A.D. 273. His birth-year may be fixed, therefore, approximately at about A.D. 210. His name, Cassius Longinus, shows that he was, either in his own person or through some one of his ancestors, connected with the *gens* of the celebrated jurist, who was governor of Syria in the middle of the first century.² It is not improbable that the connexion of his family with the Cassii dated from that time. His mother was a native of Emesa, in Apamene, and her brother, Fronto, was a celebrated teacher of rhetoric at Athens.³ Longinus himself tells us, in the preface or dedication to Amelius of his book on the *summum bonum* (περὶ τέλους), that when a mere boy he had made many journeys with his parents, and had heard the most eminent philosophers in various places.⁴ Among these was his uncle Fronto, who adopted him as his heir; and it is reasonable to suppose that he was born, not at Athens, as Ruhnken concludes,⁵ but in Apamene, probably at Emesa, and that after these juvenile

Niebuhr says (*Lectures on the Hist. of Rome*, II. p. 272) that 'he is very much overrated.' We should have been glad to hear some reasons for this opinion, which seems rather inconsistent with the admiration expressed by Niebuhr in this very passage.

¹ The best and fullest account of Longinus is the elegant *Dissertatio de Vitâ et scriptis Longini*, published by Ruhnken in 1776, under the name of Peter John Schardam, and afterwards by Toup in his edition of Longinus, for which it was originally destined. 'Hanc dissertationem,' says the enthusiastic Wyttienbach (*Vita Davidis Ruhnkenii*, p. 169), 'equidem non dubito immortalem appellare.'

² Tacit. *Ann.* XII. 11.

³ Suidas, s.v. Φρόντων Ἐμισσηνός.

⁴ Porphyr. *Vit. Plotin.* c. 20. p. LXX. Creuzer: ἔτι δὲ μεираκίων ὄντων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λόγων προέστησαν οὓς ἀπαντας μὲν ὑπῆρξεν ἰδεῖν ἡμῖν, διὰ τὴν ἐκ παιδῶν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς τόπους ἅμα τοῖς γονεῦσιν ἐπιδημίαν.

⁵ 'Equidem multo pronior sim in sententiam Is. Jonsii *De Script. Hist. Phil.* III. 4, Athenas Longino patriam tribuentis;' *Dissert.* p. 5, ed. Toup.

travels he was settled at Athens under the care of Fronto. He must, before this, have spent some time at Alexandria, where he received instructions from Ammonius Saccas and Origen the heathen, and at Rome, where he was taught by Amelius and Plotinus.¹ Although he was thus initiated into the mysteries of Neo-Platonism, and was long afterwards, as his letter to Porphyry shows,² much interested in the speculations of Plotinus, his mind was instinctively led to an older school of thought. He studied diligently and commented on the writings of Plato himself,³ paying attention to the language and style no less than to the subject matter. It was with reference to this regard for the letter of the old philosophical texts that Plotinus said of him: 'Longinus is a philologer certainly, but by no means a philosopher.'⁴ His studies were so profound and general, and his information so accurate and diversified, that he is called by Eunapius 'a living library and a walking museum.'⁵ It is stated that his time at Athens was so much taken up with teaching that he had no leisure for literary composition.⁶ This is contradicted by the long list of his works. Among his pupils the most celebrated was Porphyry. It seems that Porphyry must have gone directly from the teaching of Longinus to that of Plotinus, when he visited Rome for the second time about A.D. 263, and that the views, which Plotinus requested Amelius to answer, must have been those which he had learned from his teacher at Athens. At the same time it appears from the letter of Longinus, which Porphyry has preserved in his life of Plotinus, that the works of the latter were highly esteemed by the teacher of his biographer, not on account of their subjects, for which he cared but little, but on account of their style and the

¹ Porphyr. *Vit. Plotin.* p. LXXI. Creuzer.

² *Id. ibid.* c. 19. p. LXIX.

³ See Ruhnken, *Dissert.* pp. 9, 10.

⁴ Porphyr. *Vit. Plotin.* c. 14. p. LXIV., Creuzer: φιλόλογος μὲν ἔφη ὁ Λογγίνος, φιλόσοφος δὲ οὐδαμῶς. On this passage see Ruhnken, *Dissert.* p. 11, and Creuzer's note in answer to him.

⁵ Eunapius, *Porphyr.* p. 13: Λογγίνος δὲ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐκείνον βιβλιοθήκη τις ἦν ἔμψυχος καὶ περιπάτου μουσείον: see Ruhnken, *u.s.* p. 14.

⁶ Joannes Siceliota, *Scholia in Hermog. περὶ ἰδεῶν α*, vol. VI. p. 95, Walz.: ὁ μὲν γὰρ Λογγίνος περὶ τὸ διδάσκειν μόνον ἐνασχολούμενος καὶ περὶ τὸ γράφειν τελείας ὑποθέσεις οὐκ ἔχων καιρόν.

closeness of their logic.¹ We learn from Porphyry that when Longinus wrote that letter, that is, when Porphyry was in Sicily A.D. 269, Longinus had left Athens and had gone to Syria, being at that time on the coast in Phœnicia.² It was during this visit to the East that he became known to Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra, who adopted the celebrated scholar, first as her instructor in the language and literature of Greece,³ and ultimately as her confidential adviser, and, in fact, as her chief minister.⁴ It was he, it seems, who urged Zenobia to assert her independence of the Roman empire, perhaps conceiving himself bound to imitate his favourite Plato, who had encouraged Dion to liberate his country from the tyranny of Dionysius.⁵ He has the credit of composing the spirited letter in which the queen rejected Aurelian's summons to surrender.⁶ But his wisdom might have taught him that he was engaged in a hopeless struggle. The battle near Emesa, his own, or at least his mother's native city, had obliged Zenobia to take refuge within the walls of Palmyra, which, after a brief resistance, fell to the Romans, and Longinus was put to death by the conqueror, partly, it is said,⁷ because his mistress indicated him as the author of the evil counsels which had led her to array herself against Rome. He met his death with a constancy worthy of the philosophy which he professed.⁸

Longinus appears, like Lucian, as an oriental Greek, whom a careful study of the classical authors, a long residence at Athens, and his natural temperament, had emancipated from the influences of his birth and early associations, and who had consequently become a genuine Greek of the old school.

¹ Porphyr. *Vit. Plot.* c. 19. pp. LXIX., LXX. Creuzer; ὅτι τῶν μὲν ὑποθέσεων οὐ πᾶν με τὰς πολλὰς προσέσθαι συμβέβηκε· τὸν δὲ τύπον τῆς γραφῆς καὶ τῶν ἐννοιῶν τὰνδρὸς τὴν πυκνότητα καὶ τὸ φιλόσοφον τῆς τῶν ζητημάτων διαθέσεως ὑπερβαλλόντως ἀγαμαὶ καὶ φιλῶ.

² *Id. ibid.* p. LXVIII.

³ Vopiscus, *Aurelian*, 30: 'quo (Longino) illa magistro usa esse ad Græcas litteras dicitur.'

⁴ Phot. *Cod.* CCLXV.; Suid. s.v. Λογγίνος.

⁵ Ruhnken, *Dissert.* p. 19.

⁶ Vopiscus, *Aurelian*. 27, 30.

⁷ Zosimus, I. 56: ἐπεὶ δὲ αἰτίας ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὴν ἐξαιροῦσα πολλοὺς τε ἄλλους ἦγεν εἰς μέσον ὡς παραγαγόντας ὅλα γυναῖκα, ἐν οἷς καὶ Λογγίνος ἦν.

⁸ *Id. ibid.*: παραχρῆμα ὁ βασιλεὺς θανάτου ζημίαν ἐπέθηκεν, ἣν οὕτω γενναίως ἤνεγκεν ὁ Λογγίνος ὥστε καὶ τοὺς σχετλιάζοντας ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει παραμυθεῖσθαι.

Although he had been trained by the Neo-Platonists, and felt great respect for their character and abilities, he deliberately withdrew himself from their sect, and fell back upon the principles of Plato himself, which he sought to eliminate, not by an accommodation of what he read to oriental traditions, but by an honest employment of grammatical criticism: and it was by this that he exposed himself to the reproach of Plotinus, which has been already mentioned—that he was not a philosopher, but a philologer; not a speculator, but an interpreter. In the same old Greek spirit, he did not seek to experimentalize on Platonic principles with a ruined city, like Plotinus; but went heart and soul into an attempt to create a true nationality in the land of his birth, and paid with his life for the ill-success of an attempt, which, if his wishes had been realized, would have led to practical consequences of historical importance.

§ 6. Of the numerous writings of Longinus¹ only fragments have been preserved, and the most important of these has been claimed for another writer, and for the Augustan age. According to the titles, he wrote commentaries on Homer,² Plato,³ Demosthenes,⁴ on certain poets such as Antimachus,⁵ and even on the rhetoric of Hermogenes.⁶ To his critical works belonged a commentary on the violations of history by the grammarians,⁷ an Attic Lexicon,⁸ a sort of gazetteer (*περὶ ἐθνικῶν*),⁹ some scholia on the metrical manual of Hephæstion, which are still extant in part,¹⁰ two essays on composition,¹¹ and a treatise on rhetoric, which Ruhnken¹² discovered in the midst of a treatise by Apsines. His philosophical works were—his treatise on the end of life, the preface to which is quoted in Porphyry's life of

¹ See the list in Ruhnken, *Dissert.* pp. 22 sqq.

² Suidas.

³ Ruhnken, *u.s.* pp. 9, 10.

⁴ Suidas; Photius, *Cod.* CCLXV.

⁵ Suidas, where we should read with Hemsterhuis *κατὰ Ἡρακλέωνος*, namely, 'against Heracleon,' the grammarian of Ephesus.

⁶ Ruhnken, *u.s.* p. 24.

⁷ Suidas.

⁸ Photius, *Lex.* s.v. *σέρφοι*.

⁹ *Bibl. Coislin.* p. 597.

¹⁰ Gaisford's *Hephæst.* p. 137.

¹¹ *περὶ συνθέσεως λόγων συντάγματα δύο*, quoted by the author himself, *De Sublim.* § 39.

¹² See Wytttenbach, *Vita Ruhnkenii*, p. 127; Wolf, *Analect. Litter.* II. 515—526; Schöll, *Hist. d. l. Litt. Gr.* IV. p. 331. The tract is printed as *ἐκ τῶν Διογύλου περὶ εὐρέσεως* in Walz's *Rhetores Græci*, vol. IX. pp. 543—596.

Plotinus;¹ his essays on natural instinct (περὶ ὁρμῆς)² and the first principles of things (περὶ ἀρχῶν),³ his letter to Amelius respecting the philosophy of Plotinus,⁴ and his tract against the same philosopher on the Platonic notion of justice;⁵ his books 'on ideas' against Plotinus and against Porphyry;⁶ and a treatise on the soul, in which he specially impugned some of the doctrines of the Stoics.⁷ At the end of his life he composed a panegyric on Odænathus the husband of Zenobia.⁸ His most extensive work was entitled 'the philologers' (οἱ φιλόλογοι), or 'philological conversations' (φιλόλογοι ὁμιλῖαι), in at least twenty-one books.⁹ It is a reasonable conjecture that the treatise 'on the sublime' (περὶ ὑψους), on which the fame of Longinus depends, is an extract from this great work. It is unfortunately a mutilated remnant, being found in only one original manuscript;¹⁰ and we have lost a treatise 'on the passions,' which was its natural sequel.¹¹ Cæcilius of Calacte had written a book on the same subject; and in addressing his essay to his friend Posthumius Terentianus, Longinus mentions that he was led to the composition of his work by their finding, on their joint perusal of the little book by Cæcilius, that its style did not correspond to its subject,¹² and that the author had neglected many of the principal points in his discussion. Now the oldest Paris manuscript states that the treatise is by 'Dionysius or Longinus' (Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου), and a Florentine manuscript attributes it to an anonymous writer.¹³ From this it has been inferred that the work is not properly ascribed to Dionysius Longinus, but was written by Dionysius of Pergamus,¹⁴ Dionysius of Miletus,¹⁵ or even Dionysius

¹ p. LXX. Creuzer.

³ *Ibid.* c. 14. p. LXIV.

⁵ *Id. ibid.* ⁶ *Id. ibid.*

⁸ Liban. *Epist.* 998.

² *Ibid.* c. 17. p. LXVII.

⁴ Ruhnken, *u.s.* p. 25.

⁷ Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* XV. 21.

⁹ Ruhnken, *Dissert.* p. 16.

¹⁰ The authorship of the treatise has been discussed by F. A. Wolf, *Analect. Litterar.* vol. II. p. 625 sqq.

¹¹ *De Sublim.* ad fin.: κράτιστον δ' ἂν εἴη καὶ ταῦτ' ἐὰν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰ συνεχῇ χωρεῖν· ἥν δὲ ταῦτα τὰ πάθη, περὶ ὧν ἐν ἰδίῳ προηγουμένος ὑπεσχόμεθα γράψειν ὑπομνήματι.

¹² § 1: ταπεινότερον ἐφάνη τῆς ὅλης ὑποθέσεως, 'que la bassesse de son style répondoit assez mal à la dignité de son sujet' (Boileau).

¹³ 'Ανωρόμου περὶ ὑψους.

¹⁴ This is Weiske's opinion (*ad Longin.* p. 218).

¹⁵ Schöll adopts this conjecture: see Westermann, *Gesch. d. Bereds.* § 94, note 6.

of Halicarnassus.¹ The latter supposition is overthrown at once by the style and by the manner in which reference is made to Cæcilius of Calacte, the personal friend of the Halicarnassian rhetorician. The diction shows that it belongs to the age of Longinus; and there is hardly any writer of that age, except Longinus, who could have produced a work of so much eloquence and learning. It exhibits throughout a sound and solid judgment, great reading in the best authors, a lively and impressive style, and a remarkable felicity of illustration. There is no work which gives better practical rules for the attainment of excellence in composition. It was the intention of the author to show wherein powerful and impressive writing really consists. He was not merely writing on the kind of style which Cicero described as grand or elevated (*grandis, grandiloquus*), in contradistinction to that which he called plain or humble (*tenuis*).² It is clear that he refers rather to the thoughts than the words; his criterion of sublimity or impressiveness is the effect produced on the hearer or reader. ‘This,’ he says,³ ‘is truly great, which supplies the mind with much to think about, which it is difficult if not impossible to resist, and the recollection of which is strong and ineffaceable. In a word, consider that there is genuine beauty and real sublimity when all the hearers, however their age and circumstances may differ, agree in admiring it.’ The same is implied in his five sources of the sublime or impressive:⁴ namely, 1. happy boldness in the sentiments;⁵ 2. pathetic or enthusiastic vehemence,⁶ which are the two natural sources (αὐθυγενεῖς συστάσεις) of this quality; and 3. well-chosen figures;⁷ 4. elevated expressions;⁸ and 5. skilful arrangement of

¹ This is the theory of Amati: see Weiske, pp. 213—215.

² *Orator*. 6.

³ *De Sublim.* § 7: τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ ὄντι μέγα, οὐ πολλὴ μὲν ἡ ἀναθεώρησις, δύσκολος δὲ, μάλλον δὲ ἀδύνατος ἡ κατεξανάστασις· ἰσχυρὰ δὲ ἡ μνήμη καὶ δυσεξάλειπτος. ὅλως καὶ καλὰ νόμιζε ὕψη καὶ ἀληθινὰ τὰ διαπαντὸς ἀρέσκοντα καὶ πᾶσιν· ὅταν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἐπιτηδευμάτων, βίων, ζηλῶν, ἡλικίων, λόγων, ἐν τι καὶ ταῦτόν ἑμα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν δοκῇ, τόθ’ ἡ ἐξ ἀσυμφώνων ὡς κρίσις καὶ συγκατάθεσις τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ θαυμαζομένῳ πίστιν ἰσχυρὰν λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναμφίλεκτον.

⁴ § 8.

⁵ τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις ἀδρεπιβολόν. For Ruhnken’s mistake on this passage, see *New Cratylus*, § 305 (b).

⁶ τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος.

⁷ ποῖα τῶν σχημάτων πλάσις.

⁸ ἡ γενναία φράσις.

the words.¹ It has always been considered a remarkable circumstance that Longinus should have taken one of his earliest examples of sublimity from the book of *Genesis*, which he quotes from memory:² ‘In this way, also, the Jewish legislator, no ordinary man (οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνὴρ), after he had conceived an adequate notion of the power of Deity, has also expressed it by writing at the beginning of his laws, *God said*—what?—let there be light, and it was; let there be earth, and it was.’ The merits of this treatise were recognized at a very early period after the revival of letters, and Casaubon pronounced it ‘a golden book;’³ but its popularity, and the implicit deference with which it has been received as an authority in matters of literary taste, is perhaps due to the fact that when France, in the reign of Louis XIV., gave a tone to the literary judgments of Europe, this treatise was translated and illustrated by Boileau,⁴ the favourite prose writer of the *grand monarque*, and was received by the wits of Paris as an established manual in all that concerned the sublime and beautiful.

¹ ἡ ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις.

² § IX. p. 22, Toup.

³ Boileau, *Préface* (*Œuvres Complètes*, p. 345): ‘Casaubon l’appelle un livre d’or.’ Similarly Ruhnken, *Dissert.* p. 24: ‘Hic liber vere aureus.’

⁴ *Traité du Sublime, traduit du Grec de Longin*, 1674.

CHAPTER LV.

HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY UNDER THE ANTONINES AND THEIR
SUCCESSORS.

§ 1. Plutarch's historical works. § 2. Arrian's *Anabasis* and *Indica*. § 3. Appian's *Roman History* arranged according to the different Countries. § 4. Dion Cassius: his *History of Rome*. § 5. Herodian's *History of the Successors of the Antonines*. § 6. Philo of Byblus, and his *Phœnician Records*. § 7. Pausanias the tourist.

§ 1. **PLUTARCH**, whose philosophical writings have been already examined, is even better known as a biographer than as a Platonist. In addition to his forty-six lives of celebrated Greeks and Romans, which we shall notice in detail, he wrote the following treatises, more or less referring to history and biography:—

(a) 'Roman questions' ('Ρωμαϊκά, ἡ αἰτίαι ῥωμαϊκαί), a treatise on Roman usages and antiquities.

(b) 'Greek questions' (Ἑλληνικά, ἡ αἰτίαι ἑλληνικαί), a similar treatise on special points referring to his own countrymen.

(c) 'On the fortune of the Romans' (περὶ τῆς 'Ρωμαίων τύχης), in which he endeavours to settle the relations between fortune and valour as causes of the grandeur of Rome, inclining rather to the former, in opposition to the views of Polybius.

(d) 'On the fortune or valour of Alexander,' a similar discourse, or rather two discourses, on the great king of Macedon.

(e) 'Whether the Athenians were more renowned in war or for wisdom?' This is a mere fragment.

(f) 'On the malignity of Herodotus' (περὶ τῆς Ἡροδότου κακοηθείας). This is an attempt to show that Herodotus was not impartial, and that he was unduly prejudiced against Plutarch's countrymen, the Thebans. That the writer's patriot-

ism has misguided him has been sufficiently shown in a former chapter.¹

(g) 'An Epitome of the comparison between Menander and Aristophanes' (ἐπιτομή τῆς συγκρίσεως Μενάνδρου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους), a fragment of literary biography and criticism, in which Menander is preferred to his great predecessor. The 'Lives of the ten orators' and the 'Greek and Roman parallels' are obviously not the works of Plutarch. The former is a series of rough sketches, probably drawn up as memoranda by some rhetorician of the time of Dionysius the Halicarnassian. The latter is an attempt to bolster up the mythical history of Greece by citations of analogous circumstances in the annals of Rome, and was probably attributed to Plutarch merely because he wrote parallel biographies. It is quite unworthy of him.

The minor works, which we have just enumerated, are comparatively neglected: but Plutarch enjoys a reputation and popularity equal to that of any Greek writer, in consequence of his lives of eminent Greeks and Romans, the translations of which have made his name familiar to a multitude of readers in every country in Europe, and even established his name as a general designation for a collection of biographies.² This well-known work is entitled 'Parallel Lives' (Βίοι παράλληλοι), and, as we have it, gives us twenty-two pairs of biographical sketches, each containing a spirited account of the life, talents, and virtues of an eminent Greek and Roman, followed by a brief comparison (σύγκρισις) of their merits, after the manner of the separate work on Aristophanes and Menander. The following are the forty-six worthies thus exhibited in pairs of portraits: 1. *Theseus* and *Romulus*; 2. *Lycurgus* and *Numa*; 3. *Solon* and *Valerius Publicola*; 4. *Themistocles* and *Camillus*; 5. *Pericles* and *Fabius Maximus*; 6. *Alcibiades* and *Coriolanus*; 7. *Timoleon* and *Æmilius Paullus*; 8. *Pelopidas* and *Marcellus*; 9. *Aristeides* and *Cato Major*; 10. *Philopæmen* and *T. Quintius*

¹ See chapter XIX. § 5, p. 272.

² For example, a work published at the beginning of this century, and containing the lives of the chief heroes of the French Revolution is called '*The Revolutionary Plutarch*;' and about ten years ago a book appeared with the title '*The Modern British Plutarch, or lives of men distinguished in the recent history of our country*.'

Flaminius ; 11. *Pyrrhus* and *Marius* ; 12. *Lysander* and *Sulla* ; 13. *Cimon* and *Lucullus* ; 14. *Nicias* and *Crassus* ; 15. *Eumenes* and *Sertorius* ; 16. *Agésilas* and *Pompey* ; 17. *Alexander the Great* and *Julius Cæsar* ; 18. *Phocion* and *Cato of Utica* ; 19. *Agis* and *Cleomenes* and the two *Gracchi* ; 20. *Demosthenes* and *Cicero* ; 21. *Demetrius Poliorcetes* and *Marc Antony* ; 22. *Dion* and *M. Brutus*.¹ It will be seen that some of these pairs are very arbitrary, and that the grounds for special comparison must be in these cases somewhat far-fetched. So that we do not feel much interest in the juxtaposition, and are quite as well contented with the lives which have not come down to us in duplicates, namely those of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, *Aratus the Sicyonian*, and the emperors *Galba* and *Otho*.² The life of *Homer* attributed to Plutarch was probably not written by him, and at any rate belongs to a different class, that of the literary biographies, which are said to have contained the lives of *Hesiod*, *Pindar*, *Crates the Cynic*, and *Aratus the poet*. His lost biographies of the parallel class were those of the Messenian hero *Aristomenes*, *Epaminondas* and his friend *Daiphantus*, *Scipio Africanus*, and the Roman emperors *Augustus*, *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, *Claudius*, *Nero*, and *Vitellius*, completing, with those that we have, the series of the predecessors of *Vespasian*. We believe that these lives of the Roman emperors formed a separate work, like the literary biographies. For the others it

¹ See the table of *Lamprias*, printed in *Fabricius, Bibl. Gr.* vol. V. p. 159.

² The Byzantine epigrammatist, *Agathias*, pleased himself with the reflexion that Plutarch himself was unparalleled. The following are his lines on Plutarch's statue, which *Dryden* thought worthy of a translation (*Anthol. Planudea*, No. 331 ; *Anthol. Pal.* vol. II. p. 725) :

σεῖο πολυκλήντα τύπον στᾶσαν, Χαιρωνεῦ
 Πλούταρχε, κρατερῶν νίκες Αὔσονίων,
 ὅτι παραλλήλοισι βίοις Ἑλλήνας ἀρίστους
 Ῥώμης εὐπολέμοις ἤρμοσας ἐνναέταις
 ἀλλὰ τεοῦ βίότοιο παράλληλον βίον ἄλλον
 οὐδὲ σύ γ' ἂν γράψαις· οὐ γὰρ ὅμοιον ἔχεις.

Dryden's version runs thus :

Chæronean Plutarch, to thy deathless praise,
 Does martial Rome this grateful statue raise,
 Because both Greece and she thy fame have shared,
 Their heroes written and their lives compared.
 But thou thyself couldst never write thy own ;
 Their lives have parallels, but thine has none.

is not easy to imagine parallels, unless he paired Epaminondas with Scipio, Aratus with Hannibal, whose life he could hardly have omitted to write, and Aristomenes with Junius Brutus the liberator of Rome. There will remain Daiphantus and Artaxerxes, who could scarcely be regarded as pendants to one another.

The universal and lasting popularity of Plutarch's biographies is due to the fact that they are dramatic pictures, in which each personage is represented as acting according to his leading characteristics, which are sometimes exaggerated in order to make them more prominent. Such dramatic pictures are of all countries and of all times. The imagination of the reader drapes the figure in the costume of his own age, and contemplates his actions with the lively interest of a contemporary. The graphic distinctness of Plutarch's narratives and their adaptation for the stage is shown in Shakspeare's three plays, *Coriolanus*, *Julius Cæsar*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*, which are mainly derived, sometimes even to an adoption of the words, from Thomas North's translation of Plutarch,¹ and which show the hold which these biographies are likely to take on every strong imagination. It was not by accident, but deliberately, that Plutarch adopted this method of pictorial and characteristic biography, abstaining from the details which belong to history

¹ Mr. Charles Knight, in his pictorial edition of *Shakspeare*, has given the parallel passages from North's *Plutarch*, which the dramatist has imitated in his three Roman plays, and in his supplementary notice he says (p. 349): 'nothing can be more interesting, we think, than to follow Shakspeare with Plutarch in hand. The poet adheres to the facts of history with a remarkable fidelity. A few hard figures are painted upon a canvass: the outlines are distinct, the colours are strong, but there is no art in the composition, no grouping, no light and shadow. This is the historian's picture. We turn to the poet. We recognize the same figures, but they appear to live,' &c. In this contrast the critic has forgotten what he had said in a previous page (*Introductory notice to Coriolanus*, p. 148), when, after remarking that North's *Plutarch* was 'a book worthy of Shakspeare to read and sometimes to imitate,' he adds: 'here he found the story of Coriolanus told in the most graphic manner, and he followed it pretty literally. Niebuhr places this story amongst the fabulous legends of Rome. Plutarch, and especially Shakspeare, have made it almost impossible to believe that such Romans did not really live, and think, and talk, and act, as we see them in these wonderful pictures of humanity.' It is no disparagement of Shakspeare's genius to say that Plutarch's biographies are quite as pictorial as the plays, which convert them into *tableaux vivants*.

properly so-called. In the introduction to his life of Alexander the Great, he makes the following sensible observations:¹ 'We are writing not histories but biographies; and an exhibition of virtue or vice is not exclusively confined to the most conspicuous actions, but a brief circumstance, or expression, or some sportive trait,² often displays the character more than combats in which thousands of men are slain, and the greatest pitched battles and sieges of cities. Accordingly, as painters derive likenesses from the countenance and from the expression of the face in which the character is shown,³ caring very little for the other parts of the body, so it must be allowed to us to penetrate rather to the signs of the soul, and by means of these to portray the life of each, leaving to others the great exploits and battles.'

It is this just appreciation of the work which he had undertaken that makes Plutarch's lives so interesting to all classes and to all ages. And it is obvious that the characteristic portraiture, which he has given, of so many eminent men, must be as entertaining in a translation as it is in the original. This alone would account for the fact that it is not very usual to study Plutarch in the Greek. But the faults of his style have contributed to make him less a favourite with scholars than he otherwise might be. He is not a good writer of Greek. His language is overloaded with learned allusions; it is deficient not only in Attic purity, but even in rhetorical and grammatical skill; and the reader is constantly impeded by difficulties, occasioned, not by great thoughts struggling for expression, as is the case in Thucydides and Plato, but by the carelessness of the writer, and his inability to pass from the declining idiom of his own time to that of the classical period. In this respect he offers a marked contrast to his contemporary Dion Chrysostom,⁴ and still more to Lucian, who lived in the following century.

As an authority for ancient history Plutarch is chiefly valuable as the representative of a great number of writers

¹ *Vit. Alexand.* c. I. p. 664 *ad fin.*

² *παιδία τις.*

³ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν ὄψιν εἰδῶν οἷς ἐμφαίνεται τὸ ἦθος.

⁴ Niebuhr merely remarks (*Lectures on Hist. of Rome*, II. p. 264) that 'his language is not so perfect as that of Dion Chrysostom.' It is in fact very imperfect.

whose works are no longer extant. He quotes no less than 250 different authors,¹ of whom about eighty are historians known to us only by their names or by fragments. As he probably wrote this work at the end of his life,² when he was living in dignified retirement at Chæroneia, and as he could not have access there to any large collection of books, it is probable that he made his preparations for these biographies at Rome and in other large cities where there were good libraries, marking the traces of his reading by copious extracts from his authorities. He implies something of this kind in a remarkable passage at the beginning of his life of Demosthenes, where he accounts also for his acknowledged deficiencies in Latin scholarship: 'A writer,' he says,³ 'who has undertaken a history of transactions, which are neither recent nor domestic, but for the most part foreign and scattered through a number of books, requires in the first place that the city to which he belongs should be an eminent, literary, and populous⁴ place, in order that, having an abundant supply of all kinds of books, and hearing and inquiring about all the circumstances, which, having escaped the notice of writers, have gained more obvious credit from their preservation by living memory,⁵ he may publish his work without any deficiency in great or essential particulars. We, inhabiting a little town, and loving to dwell there lest it should become less, and being prevented during our residence in Rome and Italy by public employments and philosophic intercourse from enjoying the leisure necessary for practising ourselves in Latin,⁶ began to study the literature of Rome quite late, and at an advanced age.⁷ And a strange but veritable circumstance befell us. For it was not our lot to understand and learn the facts from the language, so much as to understand the written accounts from the acquaintance which we had

¹ See the list of authors quoted by Plutarch in Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. pp. 227—243.

² This appears partly from the incompleteness of the work, but there are many specific evidences of the late period at which he composed these biographies.

³ *Vit. Demosth.* c. 2. p. 846.

⁴ εὐδόκιμον καὶ φιλόκαλον καὶ πολὺν ἀνθρώπων.

⁵ ὅσα τοὺς γράφοντας διαφεύγοντα σωτηρίᾳ μνήμης ἐπιφανεστέραν εἴληφε πίστιν.

⁶ οὐ σχολῆς οὐδὲς γυμνάζεσθαι περὶ τῇν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διάλεκτον.

⁷ ὅψέ ποτε καὶ πρόβω τῆς ἡλικίας.

somehow made with the facts themselves. But to perceive the beauty and rapid flow of the Roman style,¹ its metaphors, and its harmony, and all the other ornaments of language, this we thought, indeed, a charming and agreeable occupation; but the practice and study which it required was no light matter, except for those who had more leisure and whose age admitted such an ambitious accomplishment.' These words show that Plutarch's acquaintance with Latin authorities, at any rate, was not very accurate. And there is no doubt that wherever he could find a Greek account of Roman occurrences, he took this for his text. In the most interesting of his Roman lives, those of the two Gracchi, Plutarch must have been able to refer to some Greek memoirs unknown to us, in which a Roman or some one thoroughly acquainted with Latin had founded his narrative on the actual speeches of those celebrated demagogues. From the way in which Blossius of Cumæ is introduced,² it would almost appear that he had written something in Greek respecting Tiberius Gracchus, his friend and host. In general, Plutarch's Roman biographies are vitiated by a worse fault than his ignorance of Latin. He does not conceal the partiality which he feels for his own countrymen, and we can see throughout that in all the parallels he endeavours to make out the best case he can for the Greek. But in spite of all exceptions on the score of inaccuracy, want of information, or prejudice, Plutarch's lives must remain one of the most valuable relics of Greek literature,³ not only because they stand in the place of many volumes of lost history, but also because they are written with a graphic and dramatic vivacity, such as we find in few biographies, ancient or modern, because they are replete with reflexions, which, if not profound, are always moderate and sensible, and because the author's aim throughout is to enforce the highest standard of morality of which a heathen was capable. As one of his most enthusiastic admirers has said,

¹ 'Ρωμαϊκῆς ἀπαγγελίας.

² *Vit. Tib. Gracch.* cc. 8, 20.

³ The remark of Theodorus Gaza (*apud Artum Vigeliūm Præfat. Bibl. Histor.*) is well known. Being asked which author he would preserve, if he was allowed to select one only from the wreck of Greek learning, he answered 'Plutarch,' perhaps because he thought him the best representative of a number of writers. See also Roland Maresius, *Epist.* 24; Naudæus, *Apol. pro Eruditīs magis accus.* p. 194.

‘He stands before us as the legate, the ambassador, and the orator on behalf of those institutions, whereby the old-time men were rendered wise and virtuous.’¹

§ 2. ARRIAN, like Plutarch, has already appeared among the philosophical writers. It is probable that his historical works, like those of Plutarch, were composed in the leisure of his later years, his labours in making known the doctrines of Epictetus having been confined to the period when he was a philosophical student at Athens, and before he obtained political employment from Hadrian. His exploits as a successful general in Asia Minor seem to have impressed him with the belief that, as he had imitated Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* of Socrates in the account which he had given of the teaching of his own master Epictetus, so he might venture to follow in the steps of the same writer, by composing, like him, an *Anabasis*; and as Xenophon had, by his narrative of the celebrated retreat of the Ten Thousand, proved that Persia was easily assailable by the Greeks,² Arrian undertook to recount the historical realization of the hopes which his predecessor had suggested, and to show in the *Anabasis* of Alexander, the overthrow of the great king’s power, which had been vainly attempted in the *Anabasis* of Cyrus. We have seen³ that Ctesias occupies a parallel position to that of Xenophon as an informant respecting the Persian empire, having been in the camp of Artaxerxes while Xenophon was in that of his younger brother. Arrian recognized these counter-part functions when he wrote in the Ionic dialect, in imitation of Ctesias, and as a sequel to his own *Anabasis*, another work which has come down to us—namely, a description of India, as it was made known to the Greeks by the voyage of Nearchus, and by the researches of Megasthenes and Eratosthenes. He imitated Xenophon not only in the name but in the subject of his treatise on the chase (*Κυνηγετικός*). Besides these works, and those on Epictetus, Arrian has left us his ‘Voyage round the Euxine’ (*περίπλους πόντου Εὐξείνου*). This work was written in A.D. 137, and dedicated to Hadrian. It gives a clear account of his trip from Trapezus to Dioscurias, the Cimmerian and Thracian Bosphorus, and Byzantium. We have also a frag-

¹ *Journal of Education*, vol. II. p. 114.

² Xen. *Anab.* I. 5, § 9.

³ Chapter XXXVII. § 9.

ment of his treatise on military tactics.¹ His lost works were numerous and important. He wrote, in continuation of his *Anabasis*, a history of Alexander's successors, in ten books;² a history of the Parthians, in seventeen books, with especial reference to the wars of Trajan;³ a history of Bithynia, in eight books, from the earliest ages down to his own times, which he treated autobiographically;⁴ a history of the Alani, with reference to his great victory over them;⁵ lives of Dion,⁶ Timoleon,⁷ and the famous brigand Tilliborus.⁸

The most important of the remaining historical works of Arrian is his *Anabasis of Alexander the Great* (ἱστορίαι ἀναβάσεως Ἀλεξάνδρου, or ἀνάβασις Ἀλεξάνδρου), in seven books. This work is complete, with the exception of a few pages in the last book, which would have told us of Alexander's instructions to Antipater, of the flight of Harpalus, of Alexander's intention to visit Greece, of the motives for the journey from Opis to Ecbatana, and of the misunderstanding between Eumenes and Hephæstion. The *first* book begins with the accession of Alexander, describes his northern campaigns and the destruction of Thebes, and carries the *Anabasis* down to his arrival at Gordium. In the *second* book we have the battle of Issus and the capture of Tyre and Gaza. The *third* book begins with the conquest of Egypt, and describes the battle of Gaugamela, the death of Darius, and the march into Bactria. The principal incidents of the *fourth* book are the murder of Cleitus, the death of Callisthenes, the conspiracy of the pages, and the invasions of Scythia and India. In the *fifth* book we have the conquest of the Punjâb, the discontent of the army, admirably expressed in the speech put into the mouth of Cœnus, and the resolution to stop the course of eastern conquest. The *sixth* book, which is occupied with the details of the return

¹ Λόγος τακτικός, printed in Scheffer's collection of the *Tactici* (Ups. 1664) and in Dübner's *Arrian*, Paris, 1846, pp. 265 sqq.

² μετὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου, Phot. Cod. XCH.

³ Παρθικά, ἐν βιβλίοις ιζ'. *Id.* Cod. LVIII.

⁴ Βιθυνικά ἐν βιβλίοις η'. *Id.* Cod. XCIII.

⁵ Τὰ κατ' Ἀλανούς, ἣν ἐπέγραψεν Ἀλανικήν. *Id.* Cod. LVIII.

⁶ *Id.* Cod. XCIII.

⁷ *Id.* *ibid.*

⁸ Lucian, *Alexander*, 2 : Ἀρριανὸς γάρ, ὁ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου μαθητῆς ἀνὴρ Ῥωμαίων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις.—Τιλλιβόρου γοῦν τοῦ ληστοῦ κάκεινος βίον ἀναγράψαι ἤξιωσεν.

from India, contains a very spirited description of the valour and personal risk of Alexander in his attack on the ancient representative of Moulton. In what remains of the *seventh* book, we have the naturalization of the Macedonians in Persia, the discontent of the veterans and Alexander's speech to them, the death of Hephæstion, the events preceding that of Alexander himself, and an able but laudatory examination of the king's character. A more interesting subject can scarcely be conceived than that of Arrian's *Anabasis*, and the execution is worthy of the theme. As we have already mentioned,¹ Arrian was able to appeal to good contemporary memoirs, especially those of Ptolemy and Aristobulus; and his military knowledge gave him particular advantages in describing the movements of armies and the details of battles. The style is wonderfully lucid and perspicuous. Arrian is professedly an imitator of the best writers; and he seems to have impressed their diction upon his memory so strongly, that he frequently repeats their phraseology; sometimes reproducing it without the meaning which it bears in the original passage,² and sometimes adding a word or two which explains their phraseology.³ On the whole, the *Anabasis* of Arrian is as much entitled to take a place among the books placed in the hands of young students, as his work on Epictetus is to retain its old position as a manual of instruction.

Nearchus, whose voyage from the mouth of the Indus to the Persian Gulf is mentioned in the sixth book of Arrian's *Anabasis*, and who had written an account of this adventurous navigation, has furnished the materials for the latter part of Arrian's *Indica*, the description of the interior of the country at the beginning of the book being derived from Eratosthenes and Megasthenes.

¹ Above, chapter XLVI. § 4.

² For instance, it is clear that in *Anab.* VII. 16, § 7: *καὶ πού τυχὸν καὶ ἀμείνων αὐτῷ ἦν ἐν ἀκμῇ τῆς τε ἄλλης δόξης καὶ τοῦ πόθου τοῦ παρ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπῆλλαχθαι*, he is imitating Thucyd. II. 42: *καὶ δι' ἐλαχίστου καιροῦ τύχης ἅμα ἀκμῇ τῆς δόξης μάλλον ἢ τοῦ δέους ἀπηλλάγησαν*, though it may be proved that here δόξης does not depend on ἀκμῇ but on ἀπηλλάγησαν.

³ As in *Anab.* II. 11. § 5: *ἡ νύξ οὐ διὰ μακροῦ ἐπεγενομένη ἀφείλετο αὐτὸν τὸ πρὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀλῶναι*, where the additional words explain *Æsch. Pers.* 428: *ὥς κελαίνης νυκτὸς ὅμμι' ἀφείλετο*.

The last words of the treatise are :¹ ' Let this essay have been written by me, referring also to Alexander, son of Philip the Macedonian.' This shows that the book was written after the *Anabasis*, and was intended to serve as a supplement to it. But there are no grounds for the assumption that it is to be regarded as the eighth book of the former work. The difference in the dialect indicates that it was intended to be a distinct publication. And there can be no doubt that Arrian wished to show that he could rival the Ionic dialect of Ctesias, no less than the Attic of Xenophon. But it was not from any respect for Ctesias that he thus entered into rivalry with him ; he speaks of his authority as contemptible in a passage of the *Anabasis*,² and there is little doubt that he wished to supersede his inaccurate geography by one written in the same style, but resting on trustworthy authorities. The book is valuable as far as it goes, but the author is quite unacquainted with Southern Hindostan, which he supposes to be uninhabitable from the heat.

§ 3. We know nothing of the life of APPIAN, except that he was a native of Alexandria, that he was a contemporary of Trajan,³ Hadrian,⁴ and the Antonines, and that after practising as an advocate in the courts at Rome, he was raised to the highest dignity in his own country, being procurator of the emperors there. This he has told us at the end of his preface.⁵ His autobiography, to which he refers those who desire further particulars, is unfortunately lost. It appears that he was engaged in writing his book in A.D. 147.⁶

Appian's object was to write a general history of the Roman empire, divided into separate sections according to the geographical distinctions of the different countries, or, in his history

¹ c. 43. § 14 : οὗτός μοι ὁ λόγος ἀναγεγράφθω, φέρων καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Φιλίππου τὸν Μακεδόνα.

² *Anab.* V. 4. § 2 : Κτησίας μὲν εἰ δὴ τῷ ἱκανὸς καὶ Κτησίας εἰς τεκμηρίωσιν.

³ Trajan is mentioned as a contemporary of the writer (ἐπ' ἐμοῦ) in *Bell. Civ.* II. 90, *ad fin.*

⁴ *De reb. Syriac.* 50 : καὶ Ἀδριανὸς αὖθις ἐπ' ἐμοῦ.

⁵ c. XV : Ἀππιανὸς Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐς τὰ πρῶτα ἦκων ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ δίκας ἐν Ῥώμῃ συναγορεύσας ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων, μέχρι με σφῶν ἐπιτροπεύειν ἤξιωσαν καὶ εἰ τῷ σπουδῇ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μαθεῖν, ἔστι μοι καὶ περὶ τούτου συγγραφή. It was Fronto who obtained for him the office of procurator : see M. Corn. Fronto, *Epist. ad Antonin. Pium*, 9. p. 13 sqq., ed. Niebuhr.

⁶ Saxe, *Onomastic.* I. p. 306.

of the civil wars, according to the generals whose exploits were most prominent.¹ His model was the *Origines* of Cato.² He had found the synchronistic method very distracting, as the scene was always changing, and he resolved to maintain the ethnographic distinctions until each successive state was merged in the Roman empire. Accordingly, his *Roman History* (Ῥωμαϊκά, or Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία) was divided into twenty-four books, arranged in the following series of special treatises: Book I., entitled Ῥωμαϊκῶν βασιλική,³ contained the history of the seven kings of Rome; Books II.—V. treated of the wars of the Romans in Italy, with the Samnites and Gauls, in Sicily and the other islands, and were entitled Ἰταλική, Σαμνιτική, Κελτική, Σικελική, καὶ Νησιωτική; Book VI., entitled Ἰβηρική, discussed the wars in Spain; Book VII., entitled Ἀννιβαϊκή, the war with Hannibal; Book VIII., entitled Λιβυκή, Καρχηδονική, καὶ Νομαδική, the Punic wars in Africa; Book IX., called Μακεδονική, the wars with Macedon; Book X., called Ἑλληνικὴ καὶ Ἰωνική, the wars in Greece and Asia Minor; Book XI., Συριακὴ καὶ Παρθική, those in Syria and with the Parthians; Book XII., Μιθριδάτειος, the war with Mithridates. In Books XIII.—XXI., which are called Ἐμφύλια, with the sub-title of τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ for the last four, there is a detailed account of the civil wars of Rome from the time of Marius and Sulla down to the battle of Actium and the conquest of Egypt. Book XXII., called Ἐκατονταετία, contained the history of the first century of imperial Rome, together with the statistics of the empire; Book XXIII., entitled Δακικὴ, and Book XXIV., entitled Ἀραβική, were assigned to the history of the wars in Dacia and Arabia.

Of this extensive work we have the following remains. The first five books with the eighth and ninth are represented by fragments, chiefly derived from the extracts made by the

¹ *Præf.* 15: ὧδε μὲν ἐς βίβλους ἕκαστα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἢ ἐς στρατηγούς τὰ ἐμφύλια διήρηται.

² Niebuhr, *H. R.* I. p. 8, note 2.

³ Suidas, says (s. v. Ἀππιανός): ἔγραψε Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν τὴν καλουμένην βασιλικήν. But this is a mistake, or, as Küster says in his note, 'insignis ἀπλεψία;' for he has transferred to the whole work the title of the first book.

emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus;¹ Books X., XVIII. — XXI., XXII., and XXIV., are almost entirely lost; we have the first part of Book XI. containing the Syrian war, and a later compilation instead of the second part which referred to the war with the Parthians; and the following books have come down to us entire,—namely, Books VI., VII., VIII., XII., XIII.—XVII., and XXIII., in all ten books.

The value of Appian's history depends on the accuracy with which he has availed himself of authorities no longer within our reach;² and we can see from those cases, in which we still have the books referred to by him, that he was an honest and careful compiler.³ With this encouragement to rely upon him, we may consider it very fortunate that time has spared his five books on the Civil Wars, for which we have no substitute. He does not very often refer to the books which he used; but he mentions among his authorities Cassius, Hieronymus of Cardia, Fabius Pictor, Polybius, Rutilius Rufus, Claudius, Varro, Julius Cæsar, Asinius Pollio, and the commentaries of Augustus, and he seems to have made much use of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for whose lost books his work is partly a salvage.⁴ Throughout his interest is shown in warlike transactions rather than in peaceful incidents, and he exhibits a warm feeling on behalf of

¹ See below, chapter LX. § 11.

² Scaliger, in his notes on Eusebius, calls Appian *alienorum laborum fucum*, and charges him with copying literally from Polybius, from the commentaries of Augustus, and other authorities. Whatever effect the substantiation of this charge may have on his literary reputation, there is no doubt that it would greatly enhance the value of his work to us.

³ Photius says of him (*Cod.* LVII.): τὴν ἱστορίαν ὡς οὐδὲν τ' ἐστὶ φιλαλήθης καὶ στρατηγικῶν διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας μεθόδων, εἴ τις ἄλλος, ὑποφύγῃ, and he bestows especial praise on the speeches which he introduces.

⁴ 'An attentive examination,' says Niebuhr (*Hist. Rom.* III. p. 202, note 353), 'produces the conviction that, so far as Dionysius goes, Appian does nothing but abridge his account, and thus supplies his place—except where he may have misunderstood him.' Niebuhr did not entertain a very high opinion of Appian. He says in his *Lectures* (I. p. 71) that 'the sources which he used were indeed very good, but he did not know how to use them: he is ignorant and bold. He believed, for example, that Britain lay quite close to the northern coast of Spain (*De reb. Hisp.* c. 1), and he places Saguntum on the northern bank of the Iberus (*ib.* cc. 7, 10).' Wyttenbach took a much more favourable view of his merits (*Biblioth. Crit.* vol. III. p. 93). He says: 'equidem adhuc de Appiano ita censeo, ut eum optinnis historicis veluti Thucydidi, Livio et similibus nec adjungendum nec longe postponendum judicem.'

the conquering Romans. He tells us in his preface that he has paid only occasional attention to chronology. 'I have deemed it superfluous,' he says,¹ 'to mention the dates; but I shall note them at intervals in the more important transactions.' His occasional errors in geography were natural results in the case of a writer who had not travelled extensively, and there is no indication of culpable negligence on his part. His style is clear, simple, and idiomatic, and he avoids all the rhetorical faults of his age. As a good judge has said,² he is elegant without affectation, and follows the best models without relinquishing his own characteristics; nor does he imitate ancient writers except Herodotus, whom he takes as his pattern, not so much for his diffuseness of narrative as for the turns of expression and general colouring of his diction.

§ 4. DION CASSIUS COCCEIANUS, son of Cassius Apronianus, a Roman senator, and, as it is supposed,³ grandson, on the mother's side, of the famous rhetorician Dion Chrysostomus Cocceianus, was born at Nicæa in Bithynia in A.D. 155.⁴ He spent the greater part of his life in Rome,⁵ and after holding the offices of quæstor, ædile, and prætor, was twice raised to the consulship, by Septimius Severus in A.D. 219 or 220, and by Alexander Severus in A.D. 229.⁶ He professed to have been directed by dreams to undertake the history of his own times,⁷ and he found more solid encouragement in the approbation with which the emperor Severus received his first attempt—an account of the reign of Commodus.⁸ It was in a retirement, which he sought at Capua, that he diligently collected the materials for his works for about ten years,⁹ and he spent twelve years in writing his book,¹⁰ which was completed at his native place Nicæa.¹¹ Here he seems to have died

¹ c. 13: τοὺς δὲ χρόνους ἐπὶ μὲν πᾶσι περισσὸν ἡγοῦμην καταλέγειν, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐπιφανεστάτων ἐκ διαστήματος ὑπομνήσω.

² Wytténb. u.s. p. 95.

³ Reimarus, *De Vitâ et scriptis Dionis*, § 4, in the second vol. of his edition, pp. 1533 sqq.

⁴ *Id. ibid.* § 7.

⁵ *Id. ibid.* § 10.

⁶ *Id.* § 13.

⁷ See his own account of the matter, LXXII. 23. All the passages in which Dion refers to himself are collected by Reimarus, vol. II. pp. 1528 sqq.

⁸ This work was composed about A.D. 195. Reimarus, § 9.

⁹ From 201 to 211, according to Reimarus.

¹⁰ From 211 to 222.

¹¹ Some short time after 229, to which the work extends, though the events of the seven years after 222 are very briefly given.

at an advanced age, some few years after his second consulship.¹

The great work of Dion Cassius was a history of Rome ('Ρωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία) from the foundation of the city to the year A.D. 229. Besides this, a number of works, now lost or incorporated in his history, are attributed to him by Suidas² and others. The history consisted of eighty books, of which Books XXXVII.—LX. have come down to us complete or nearly so, the remainder of the work being represented by fragments of different kinds. In the tenth century, when the whole work was in existence, excerpts were made from it by the order of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and in the twelfth century Zonaras undertook an abridgment of the first 20 books, which, with those from the 36th book to the end, were then extant. The latter part of the work, from the 36th to the 80th book, had been abridged in the eleventh century by a monk named Joannes Xiphilinus. There are detached fragments, more or less considerable, of the 35th and 36th books referring to the campaign of Lucullus against Mithridates, and Pompey's war with the pirates. On the other hand, there are many gaps in the 37th, 55th, 56th, 57th, 58th, 59th, and 60th books. The following is the general arrangement of the latter part of the work, which was continued down to the time of Constantine the Great by some Christian writer, who is supposed to have been Joannes Antiochenus. Books XXXVII.—XL. comprise the history of Rome from A.U.C. 689 to A.U.C. 704, *i.e.* from the overthrow of Mithridates to the breaking out of the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey. Books XL.—XLIV. contain the history from A.U.C. 705 to A.U.C. 710, *i.e.* from the beginning of the civil war to the death of Julius Cæsar. Books XLV.—L. include the period from A.U.C. 710 to A.U.C. 723, *i.e.* from the death of Cæsar to the battle of Actium. Books LI.—LVI. carry on the history from the conquest of Egypt to the death of Augustus (A.U.C. 724—767). Books LVII., LVIII., comprise the reign

¹ The date of his death cannot be ascertained, but according to the calculation of Fabricius he lived to about 80.

² The lexicographer confuses Cassius with Chrysostom in attributing to the former a work entitled Γετικά. The other works which he mentions are Περσικά Ἐνόδια, τὰ κατὰ Τραϊανόν, βίος Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ φιλοσόφου.

of Tiberius; Book LIX., the reign of Caligula; and Book LX., that of Claudius. In the fragments of Books LXI.—LXIII., we have the reign of Nero; in LXIV., Galba and Otho; in LXV., Vitellius; in LXVI., Vespasian and Titus; in LXVII., Domitian; in LXVIII., Nerva and Trajan; in LXIX., Hadrian; in LXX., Antoninus Pius; in LXXI., M. Aurelius; in LXXII., Commodus; in LXXIII., Pertinax and Didius Julius; in LXXIV.—LXXVI., Septimius Severus; in LXXVII., LXXVIII., Caracalla and Macrinus; in LXXIX., Elagabalus; and in LXXX., Alexander Severus.

Dion Cassius had every advantage as a writer of Roman history. His high position and experience in public life had enabled him to learn all the details of Roman administration. As Niebuhr has remarked¹ 'he finds himself at home everywhere, in constitutional matters and the civil law, as well as on tactics.' He was thoroughly acquainted with the Latin language,² and he seems to have been familiar with Tacitus³ and other Latin writers. The greatest confidence may be placed in the diligence and accuracy with which he used his authorities;⁴ and in the part of his history, in which he describes the events of his own times or the age immediately preceding his own, Dion must be regarded as a trustworthy recorder of facts,⁵ though it is clear

¹ *Lectures on the History of Rome*, I. p. 73.

² This statement must not be understood as claiming for him a greater amount of philological knowledge than belonged even to Romans of his age. For example, we should hardly agree with him in deriving *curia* from *cura*, or in considering it as a synonym for *φροντιστήριον* (*Excerpta Peiresciana*, p. 770).

³ In reporting the laconic saying of the centurion Sulpicius Asper, Dion spoils it by an addition, which is often the case in the second-hand report of a good story. Tacitus says (*Annal.* XV. 68): 'breviter respondens non aliter tot flagitiis ejus subveniri posse,' which Dion (LXII. 24, *Excerpt. Mai*) gives thus: ὅτι ἄλλως σοι βοηθήσαι οὐκ ἡδυνάμην οὐδὲ παῦσαι ἀσχημονοῦντα εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ἀνελεῖν σε. He may also have referred to Suetonius, *Nero*, 36. For a similar instance compare Dion, LXII. 24, *apud Xiphil.*, with Tacit. *Annal.* XV. 67.

⁴ He lays claim to the credit of having used his authorities with great judgment and care: *Fragm.* I. 2, Bekker.

⁵ Occasionally, however, he falls into strange confusion, as when (LIX. 20) he substitutes L. Piso, the son of Cn. Piso and Plancina, who was proconsul of Africa under Caligula, for M. Silanus, the father-in-law of that emperor (*Tac. Hist.* IV. 48), and he mixes up the events of A.D. 59 with those of A.D. 65 (cf. Tacit. *Ann.* XIV. 15, XVI. 4) in his account of Nero's performance on the stage (LXI. 20, *ap. Xiphil.*)

that he was not free from the prejudices of his age and station, and that while he underrated the ancient virtue which he was unable to appreciate,¹ he endeavoured to plead on behalf of the degraded political system under which he had risen to eminence.² In the arrangement and general treatment of his materials, Dion took for his models Thucydides and Polybius, especially the latter, whom he follows in his reflexions on the causes of events and in the practical objects of his history. His style is by no means elegant, but it is not excessively overloaded with the faults of the later rhetoric, and is generally free from affectation. The speeches, which he introduces, are usually consistent with the facts, which they are intended to illustrate; but sometimes he attributes to speakers in a former age sentiments which are intended to convey only his own opinions regarding the existing state of things.³ His language is not always pure Greek, although he had evidently studied the best classical authors with great attention:⁴ he frequently introduces Latinisms, and constructs his sentences with a disregard of idioms, introducing awkward parentheses and inversions.⁵ But with all its drawbacks, his work, or rather the remains of it, must be regarded by us, as it was by the ages immediately following that of the writer, as one of the most valuable of the later contributions to the Greek history of Rome.

§ 5. Of the life of HERODIAN we know little or nothing. It

¹ See, for example, his character of Cicero, XLVI. 1—28. Niebuhr endeavours to make an excuse for this sort of detraction, *Hist. Rom.* III. note 846; *Lectures*, I. p. 73, ed. Schmitz.

² After remarking (I. p. 262, ed. W. Smith) that 'in the reign of Severus the senate was filled with polished and eloquent slaves from the eastern provinces, who justified personal flattery by speculative principles of servitude, and inculcated the duty of passive obedience, &c.,' Gibbon subjoins in a note: 'Dio Cassius seems to have written with no other view than to form these opinions into an historical system.'

³ See Gibbon's remarks on the speech of Mæcenæ (II. p. 259, note 117): 'Dio Cassius had most probably intended for the use of his master those counsels of persecution which he ascribes to a better age, and to the favourite of Augustus.'

⁴ For his imitations of Thucydides, see Poppo, *Proleg.* I. 1. p. 364 sqq., and for other authors see the instances collected by Reimarus, § 19, p. 1540. Dion himself speaks (LV. 12) of τῶν Ἑλλήνων τινὲς ὧν τὰ βιβλία ἐπὶ τῷ ἀπτικίξειν ἀναγινώσκομεν.

⁵ In Photius, *Cod.* LXXI. p. 105, perhaps we ought to read: περίοδοι τε μετὰ παρενθέσεων παρατετραμμένα, καὶ ὑπερβάτων οὐκ εὐκαιρος χρῆσις,

is conjectured¹ that he was born about A.D. 170 and died about A.D. 240, so that he was a little junior to Dion Cassius, for whose latter books, just where they fail us most, he has furnished us with a sort of substitute. His work, which is entitled 'the history of the empire after Marcus' (τῆς μετὰ Μάρκον βασιλείας ἱστορίαι βιβλία ὅκτω), in eight books, contains a period of nearly sixty years² from A.D. 180 to A.D. 238, a period occupied by the reigns of fifteen emperors, of whom only one died a natural death. The author's object was to give a lively picture of this stirring time, and he has succeeded. Few narratives, for instance, are more clearly and strikingly told than his account of the death and character of Commodus,³ or the assassination of Pertinax,⁴ or the folly and cruelty of Caracalla.⁵ Although his chronology and geography are sometimes confused and inaccurate,⁶ he always appears anxious to state the truth, and cannot, as it seems, be justly charged with partiality. His style is formed on that of Thucydides, and there are many traces of intentional imitation.⁷ Though he avoids rhetorical affectation,⁸ his diction is not always pure Greek, and there are frequent Latinisms.⁹ It is not known whether he was by birth a Greek or a Roman, but it is clear that he lived a long time in Italy.¹⁰ At the revival of letters in the fifteenth century, Herodian made his first appearance in the Latin version of Angelo Poliziano, which was received with such favour and admiration that it passed through three editions in 1493, the year of its publication,¹¹ and the adapta-

¹ By F. A. Wolf in the introduction to his edition, *Halle*, 1792, p. XXXIII.

² Cf. I. 1, § 3 sqq., II. 15, § 7. In the latter passage he tells us (before he commences the reign of Septimius Severus, which occupies the whole of his third book) that his history will comprise a period of sixty years (for we must read ἐξήκοντα for ἐβδομήκοντα) from Commodus to Gordian III.

³ I. c. 16.

⁴ II. cc. 4, 5.

⁵ IV. c. 8 sqq.

⁶ See F. A. Wolf, pp. XLIV. sqq., XLVII. sqq.

⁷ *Id. ibid.* p. LIII.

⁸ Photius, *Cod.* XCIX : λέξει χρώμενος σώφρονι μήτε ὑπεραττικίζούση καὶ τὴν ἐμφυτον ἐξυβριζούση χάριν τοῦ συνήθους μήτε πρὸς τὸ ταπεινὸν ἐκκελυμένη καὶ τὴν ἔντεχρον ὑπερορώση γνῶσιν.

⁹ Wolf, p. XLI. The diction of Herodian is enough, and more than enough, examined in the laborious indices to the edition of Irmisch, Leips. 1789—1805.

¹⁰ Wolf, p. XXXIV.

¹¹ This version was republished by Wolf.

tion of the work to this Latin form shows that the mind and feelings of the writer were themselves cast in a Roman mould.

§ 6. A peculiar interest attaches itself to a writer of this period, who was a younger contemporary of Plutarch, and whose works, if extant in a complete form, would have furnished important contributions to the history and mythology of the ancient Phœnicians. PHILO, a native of Byblos at the foot of Mount Lebanon, obtained a considerable reputation as a learned grammarian at the end of the first and at the beginning of the second century of our æra. He was born, it seems, in the reign of Nero, and lived long enough to write about Hadrian.¹ It is probable that he was established at Rome, as a client of Herennius Severus, who obtained the consulship, probably as *consul suffectus*, about the year 124 A.D.; for Philo bore the name of Herennius, and is apparently confused with this noble Roman by Suidas or one of his authorities. Besides works on history, rhetoric, and local celebrities, he engaged in labours not unlike those of Manetho and Berosus,² and made known to the literary world in general the contents of the historical books of his own nation. Eusebius, in the epochal work in which he endeavours to show that all the heathen nations borrowed their traditional learning from the Jews,³ gives an account of the ancient mythology of the Phœnicians, on the authority of a translation in nine books by Philo of Byblos from the Phœnician

¹ Our chief authority for the little that is known of this writer is the lexicographer, Suidas, who has given the following account of him : Φίλων Βύβλιος, γραμματικός. οὗτος γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἐγγύς Νέρωνος, καὶ παρέτεινεν εἰς μακρόν· ὕπατον γοῦν Σεβήρον τὸν Ἑρέννιον χρηματίσαντα αὐτὸς εἶναι φησιν, ὅτ[αν] ἦγεν ὄγδοον καὶ ἐβδομηκοστὸν ἔτος, Ὀλυμπιάδι δὲ κ' καὶ διακοσιοστῇ [leg. ἐ καὶ δ' καὶ διακοσιοστῇ, Clinton, *F. R.* p. 31, cf. 111], γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ περὶ κτήσεως καὶ ἐκλογῆς βιβλίων βιβλία ιβ'. περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὓς ἐκάστη αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἠνεγκε βιβλία λ'. περὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀδριανοῦ ἐφ' οὗ καὶ ἦν ὁ Φίλων· καὶ ἄλλα. ὅτι ὕπατος γέγονεν ὁ Φίλων Ἑρέννιος χρηματίσας, ὡς αὐτὸς φησι. That Philo was called *Herennius* is mentioned by Origen, *c. Cels.* I. p. 13.

² Above, chapter XLVI. § 5.

³ *Præp. Evang.* I. 9, pp. 30 sqq. (pp. 66 sqq. Gaisford): ἱστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα Σανχουνιάδων, ἀνὴρ παλαιάτατος, καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν χρόνων, ὡς φασι, πρεσβύτερος, δὲ καὶ ἐπ' ἀκριβεῖα καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τῆς Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας ἀποδεχθῆναι μαρτυροῦσι. Φίλων δὲ τούτου πᾶσαν τὴν συγγραφὴν ὁ Βύβλιος, οὐχ ὁ Ἑβραῖος, μεταβαλὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινικῶν γλώσσης ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν ἐξέδωκε.

history of *Sanchoniathon* of Berytus, who was placed in the time of Semiramis and before the Trojan war. This ancient writer had been cited also by Porphyry,¹ and it is agreed that the same person is intended, under a shorter name, by *Suniathon*, who is mentioned by Athenæus, along with *Mochus*, as a Phœnician historian.² There are, indeed, some critics, who are disposed to deny the existence of any such Phœnician writer,³ and it has been proposed to consider *Sanchoniathon* or *Suniathon* as the name of the sacred books of the Phœnicians rather than as that of their author.⁴ But it has been shown that *Suniatus* actually occurs as a Carthaginian name,⁵ and there is no reason to deny that Philo really found a book attributed to *Sanchoniathon*, and this Phœnician author has as much right to a personal existence as *Mochus*, who is mentioned by the accurate Strabo, and placed also before the Trojan war.⁶ The antiquity of these Phœnician annals is perhaps very much exaggerated: but this is the case with other Semitic works, which are not on that account regarded as worthless forgeries. As the book exhibited parallel cosmogonies,⁷ it is probable that either Sanchoniathon or Philo compiled it from older documents, which were extracted and placed side by side—a process which we observe also in some of the Hebrew records. That the archives of different places were compared is clear from the words of Porphyry, who states that Sanchoniathon had collected his history from the memorials of different cities, and from the writings laid up in

¹ *De Abst.* II. 56, *apud Euseb.* u.s.

² Athenæus, III. 37, p. 126 A: παρὰ τοῖς τὰ Φοινικικὰ συγγεγραφοῖσι Σουνιαθωνὶ καὶ Μωχῶ.

³ See Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, pp. 1265 sqq.

⁴ This is the opinion of Movers (*die Phönizier*, pp. 99, 116) who thinks that the name means *San-Kon-jahath* (סן כן ת) 'the whole of the law (*Sunnah*, 'doctrine') of *Kon* or Saturnus,' the shorter form signifying 'the whole law' more generally.

⁵ Justin, 20, 5, quoted by Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 282. According to Philo (*ap. Euseb.* u.s.) the name Sanchoniathon means φιλαλήθης. Bochart (*Phalæg et Canaan*, p. 772) says that in the Phœnician language 𐤍𐤏𐤔𐤕 signifies '*l'or zclus ejus*, i.e. legis seu doctrinæ verioris amicus.'

⁶ p. 757.

⁷ See Bunsen, *Ægypten*, V. pp. 256, 269, 327, where the three different cosmogonies of Philo are set forth and explained.

the temples;¹ and he tells us that Sanchoniathon got his information respecting the Jewish annals in particular from *Hierombalus* (Jerubbaal) the priest of the god *Jewo* (*Jahveh* or *Jehovah*),² whom some³ have identified with the judge and hero Gideon, also called Jerubbaal,⁴ or Jerubbosheth,⁵ the latter name indicating an abandonment of the worship of Baal and the Phœnician Hercules.⁶ It is also mentioned that the book was dedicated to *Abibalus* king of Berytus,⁷ a very old city, which claimed to have been built by the Phœnician god *Khon* or Saturn.⁸ Nothing can be inferred with any confidence from these names. But the fragments which Eusebius gives us from Philo's work enable us to see that Sanchoniathou, whoever he was, had really made acquaintance with the sacred books of the Jews, in the form in which we now have them,⁹ and this, according to the most approved results of criticism, is unfavorable to the assumption of his extreme antiquity. Special circumstances confirm the inference that the Phœnician author was not earlier than the fifth or even the fourth century B.C. In appropriating to his own countrymen the traditions of the

¹ Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* I. 9, § 17: Σαγχονιάθων . . . τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγράψας.

² Euseb. u.s. § 16: τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀληθέστατα . . . εἰληφὼς τὰ ὑπομνήματα παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰεσῶ.

³ e.g. Bochart, *Phaleg.* I. p. 770.

⁴ *Judges* VI. 32, יְרֻבָּאֵל, LXX. Ἱεροβάαλ.

⁵ 2 *Sam.* XI. 21, יְרֻבְשֶׁתַּי.

⁶ The name Ἱαρίβωλος occurs as that of a god in a Palmyrene inscription: Movers, *Phœnic.* I. p. 434. The substitution of *Bosheth*, 'shame,' for *Baul*, shows that there was a reaction against that foul worship of the Canaanites.

⁷ Euseb. u.s.: δὲ Ἀβιβάλῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ Βηρυτιῶν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναθεῖς. Porphyry seems to have considered this king as having flourished soon after Moses, and therefore as proving the date assigned to Sanchoniathon; but a fictitious dedication is by no means without precedent. See Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 289.

⁸ Steph. Byz.: Βηρυτός, πόλις Φοινίκης ἐκ μικρᾶς μεγάλῃ, κτίσμα Κρόνου.

⁹ For example, when he says (Euseb. I. 10, § 5): εὐρεῖν δὲ τὸν Αἰῶνα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων τροφήν, he seems, in spite of the gender, to be referring to Eve and the forbidden fruit, and when he makes Αἰὼν and Πρωτόγονος to spring ἐκ τοῦ Κολπία ανέμου, he is perhaps guided by *Gen.* III. 8, for Κολπία is manifestly קֶלֶת, 'the voice of the mouth of Jehovah.'

Jews he makes *Jeoud*, i.e. *Judæus*, the only son of Cronus, whom the Phœnicians call *Israel*.¹ Now the Israelites were not called *Judæi* until after the return from captivity,² which was completed under Nehemiah in B.C. 444. And in asserting that *Chna* (*Canaan*) was the first whose name was changed to *Phœnix*,³ he recognized the commencement of Greek influences, which carries us on to the next century. The rationalizing spirit, in imitation of Euhemerus, which we see in the remains of Philo, is probably due to the translator himself. And the value of this compilation consists chiefly in the fragments of genuine Phœnician traditions, which are mixed up with statements of the Jewish books, and accommodated to the preconceived system of the last editor.

To the older scholars the remains of Philo were the subject of much credulous speculation, and it has been well said that Sanchoniathon is cited by them as the witness of the most diverse opinions.⁴ A more sceptical generation either rejected him altogether or regarded him with great suspicion. The most recent writers have again set a higher value on the Phœnician fragments,⁵ and one of them has assigned to them a position of no slight importance among the materials of universal history.⁶

§ 7. As the historians of the time of the Cæsars were supplemented by the great geographer Strabo, so we find that the age of the Antonines and their successors produced, along with the historical writers whose works we have been examining, not only a historian like Arrian, who treated of geography also, but

¹ Euseb. *Pr. Ev.* I. 10. §§ 29, 30. As the circumstances refer to the sacrifice of Isaac, it is probable that there is a confusion between the name יִשְׂרָאֵל and the epithet יִצְחָק (*Gen.* XXII. 2).

² Joseph. *Antiqu.* XI. 5: ἐκλήθησαν Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ ἧς ἡμέρας ἀνέβησαν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος.

³ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* I. 10, 26: Χνᾶ τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος.

⁴ Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 1265: 'quorum in scriptis Sanchuniathon utramque facit paginam, diversissimarum sententiarum adjutor.'

⁵ The most judicious and critical view is that of Mr. Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, pp. 281 sqq.

⁶ Bunsen, *Ægypten*, V. pp. 240 sqq.

a professed describer of countries, and of their antiquities and works of art. This was PAUSANIAS, who is generally known as 'the cicerone and tourist' (ὁ περιηγητής),¹ and whose work, 'the gazetteer of Hellas' (ἡ περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος), is our best repertory of information for the topography, local history, religious observances, architecture, and sculpture of the different states of Greece. Of the personal history of Pausanias we know nothing. It has been inferred from his reference to Pelops, as having dwelt 'with us' (παρ' ἡμῶν),² that he was a native of Lydia; and there is evidence to show that he had lived long near Mount Sipylus.³ Passages in his work prove that he was a contemporary of Hadrian⁴ and the Antonines;⁵ and the latest mark of time which he gives us is the campaign against the Germans and Stauromataæ in A.D. 179.⁶ He travelled, therefore, and described his travels, at the time when the patronage of Hadrian and his successors had excited a new interest in Greece, when probably a tour in that classical land was a necessary complement to the education of highly-cultivated Romans, and when the munificence of Herodes Atticus was still adding to the beauties of Athens.

This gazetteer of Greece is in ten books, each having its title from the country described in it. Book I. is called Ἀττικά; II. Κορινθιακά; III. Λακωνικά; IV. Μεσσηνικά; V. Ἑλιακῶν α'; VI. Ἑλιακῶν β'; VII. Ἀχαικά; VIII. Ἀρκαδικά; IX. Βοιωτικά; X. Φωκικά. These books seem to have been written at considerable intervals of time. For example, the author tells us in the seventh book that the Odeium of Herodes was not built when he wrote the first book.⁷ Now this theatre was built in A.D. 162. But in the fifth book he

¹ For the force of this term, for which Pausanias himself substitutes the word ἐξηγητής, see Preller, *ad Polemon. Fragm.* p. 162 sqq. ² V. 13, § 7.

³ Böckh says (*De Pausan. Stilo, Phil. Mus.* I. p. 629): 'Lydum esse Pausaniam et ad Sipylum diutius commemoratum, rectissime monuit Siebelis (*Pref.* p. V.), collatis locis scriptoris, V. 13, § 4, II. 22, § 4, I. 21, § 5, I. 24, § 8. Immo toties Sipylenas res commemorat, ut Sipylenum Magnetem fuisse non dubitemus: cf. præter locos modo allatos, VI. 22, § 1, VIII. 2, § 3, coll. III. 22, § 4, item VIII. 17, § 3. Postremo, X. 4, § 4, Cleonis Magnetis Sipyleni familiares sermones refert.'

⁴ I. 5, § 5.

⁵ II. 27, § 7, VIII. 43, § 4, X. 34, § 2.

⁶ VIII. 43, § 6.

⁷ VII. 20, § 3.

reckons 217 years from the restoration of Corinth by Julius Cæsar, in B.C. 44, to his own time.¹ Accordingly, he wrote the fifth at least twelve years after the first. Then, in the eighth book, as we have seen, he refers to the campaign of A.D. 179. Accordingly, the eighth book was written five or six years after the fifth. And allowing for the same rate of progress, the whole work was not finished until about A.D. 184.

The geographical descriptions of Pausanias appear in the form of an itinerary, which gives the distances from place to place. But the description of places does not always follow the direct route of the traveller.² The different localities are identified by accurate details respecting their monuments, and recent travellers in Greece have found that Pausanias is still their best handbook for the discovery of ancient sites. The historical notices, which he introduces everywhere, are quite incidental and occasional, suggested by the circumstance before him; as, indeed, appears from his mode of prefacing them: 'It has occurred to me to mention, or recount,' &c.,³ is the usual commencement of his gossiping stories, whether suggested by something before his eyes or by an association of his memory. There can be little doubt that in this as in other particulars he wished to imitate Herodotus; and it is clear that he must have reproduced in his book what he had merely jotted down at the time in some memoranda. 'Pausanias,' says K. O. Müller,⁴ 'scarcely ever gives a clear picture of the situation of a town as a whole, and never exhibits the connexion of the details in a great work of art; and in passing from one part to another, he calls attention to it with no greater definiteness than one is wont to do when the work of art to be explained is actually before one's eyes; so that we are obliged to note every particle of connexion and every local designation with the full stretch of our attention; and, notwithstanding this, are often left in the dark.' If we would appreciate the peculiarities of Pausanias, we must remember that with him geographical description,

¹ V. 1, § 2; cf. II. 1, § 2, 3. § 1.

² See Müller, *Dorians*, Appendix VI. § 12, p. 441, Engl. Tr.

³ ἐπὶ ἡλθέ μοι καταλέξαι, διέναί, &c.

⁴ *Kleine Deutsche Schriften*, I. p. 235.

historical incidents, and artistic excellence, are all secondary matters as compared with the religious significance which he seeks everywhere. Whether he did or did not publish his book as a guide to future travellers, it is clear that he went about Greece himself with the feelings of a pagan pilgrim, to whom the old mythology of the Greeks was an object of religious faith. He quite believes that there was a time when the gods associated with men, and when men were raised to the rank of gods. The absence of such condescension on the part of the former, and of such exaltation of the latter in his own days, he attributes to the growth and prevalence of vice in the world. At the same time, he is willing to admit that a great deal of falsehood has been built up on a basis of ancient truth, which has been vitiated by the mixture.¹

However much we may be disposed to look with contempt on the credulity of Pausanias, we must be glad that he visited Greece with these feelings of reverence for ancient usages and traditions, for it has led him to record a multitude of provincial legends in their genuine form, in the absence of which we should be without much of our materials for the reconstruction of the Greek religious systems.

The style and language of Pausanias have always attracted a good deal of notice. His book is, in fact, the only lengthened specimen, though it is a late one, of the Asiatic style, which, as we have seen in a former chapter, was introduced by Hegesias of Magnesia, whose countryman Pausanias is supposed to have been.² It has been shown that the few fragments of Hegesias³ exhibit precisely those peculiarities of rhythm which are most remarkable in Pausanias, the same affected inversions in the order of the words, and the same feebleness of diction. It has also been remarked that in an important part of his book, the description of the Messenian wars, Pausanias had before him Myro of Priene, who was an author of the same school.⁴ The

¹ See the curious passage in VIII. 2, §§ 4—7.

² See a very satisfactory paper on this subject by A. Böckh, *De Pausaniæ Stilo Prolusio Academica*, reprinted in the *Philological Museum*, I. pp. 628 sqq.

³ As in those quoted by Dionys. *De Comp. Verb.* c. 4.

⁴ Pausan. IV. 6, § 1; Athen. VI. p. 271 F, XIV. p. 657 D.

frequent anacoluthia of nominatives absolute, the prominence which is given to accessory sentences, and the loose connexion of the sentences by means of the ordinary copulative conjunctions (*καὶ* and *δέ*), to the exclusion of all periodical structure, may probably be set down to the school in which Pausanias was formed, or which he endeavoured to revive.¹

¹ See Cicero's description of the breaking up of the periods in Hegesias, *Orator.* 67, 79.

CHAPTER LVI.

SCIENTIFIC SCHOLARS AND LEARNED COLLECTORS.

§ 1. (a) Scientific expositors: Claudius Ptolemæus, the systematic astronomer and geographer. § 2. Claudius Galenus, the reviver of Hippocratic medicine. § 3. Sextus Empiricus, the commentator on philosophical systems; and Diogenes of Laerte, the biographer of the philosophers. § 4. (b) Tacticians: Onosander and Polyænus. § 5. (c) Literary collectors: Julius Africanus. § 6. Ælian of Præneste. § 7. Athenæus of Naucratis.

§ 1. WHILE literature of a more independent and original class was flourishing under the Antonines and their successors in the second and third centuries of our æra, other writers were laying the foundations of a celebrity scarcely less enduring by expounding the scientific systems of former days, or by making miscellaneous collections of facts or extracts, to which the loss of more ancient literature would eventually assign a high place in the estimation of students. We must give some account of the most important of these works.

CLAUDIUS PTOLEMÆUS, whose name for more than 1000 years was coextensive with the sciences of astronomy and geography, was a native of Alexandria,¹ and flourished in the latter half of the second century.² This is really all that we know about his personal history. As far as we can learn, the chief merit of Ptolemy consists in his having systematized and expounded the mathematical and geographical discoveries of his predecessors, especially of the great Hipparchus and Eratosthenes, and of his

¹ The idea that he was a native of Pelusium is due entirely to a confusion between the Arabic letters ق (*kaph*) and ف (*fa*). His Arabic name *Bathalmius al-Keludi* (*Ptolemæus Claudius*) has been misread *Bathalmius al-Feludi*. See Schöll, vol. V. p. 242, 3. The supposition that he lived in Canopus rests on a passage of Olympiodorus, who probably confused the Serapeum in Canopus with that at Alexandria: Letronne, *Journal des Savans*, April, 1818, p. 200 sqq.; Delambre, *Hist. de l'Astron.* II. p. 431.

² Saxe (*Onomast.* I. p. 314) places him about the middle of that century, i.e. from 125 to 161.

immediate forerunner, MARINUS of TYRE, who had defined as well as was then possible the latitude and longitude of all the principal places in the world.¹ It is of course very difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain how far Ptolemy extended the discoveries of those who went before him.² That he was a most eminent mathematician, and that he had a great faculty of methodical exposition, is quite clear; and it is equally certain that he has taken the place of all those who went before him, by building on their foundations, and giving a new front and elevation to their contiguous and unfinished edifices. As it is not our business to write a history of mathematics or astronomy, we shall be content to give an account of his labours, considered as contributions to Greek literature.

I. The best known of the works of Ptolemy is his 'Great construction of Astronomy' (μεγάλη σύνταξις τῆς ἀστρονομίας) in thirteen books. To distinguish this from the work on astrology in four books only, or the 'four-book construction' (τετράβιβλος σύνταξις), the lengthened treatise on spherical astronomy was called ἡ μεγίστη σύνταξις, 'the greatest construction,' or simply the *μεγίστη*, from which the Arabs, by prefixing their article, framed the title *Tabrir al Magisthi*, under which the book was published in A.D. 827, and from this is derived the name *Al-magest* by which Ptolemy's great work is familiarly known. The following is a sketch of its contents. The *first* book lays down the mathematical principles of his system, which teaches, in opposition to the true conjectures of Pythagoras, and, at a later period, of Aristarchus of Samos, that the earth is the fixed centre of the solar system, and that the *primum mobile* carried the stars and planets, including the sun, round the earth in twenty-four hours.³ This erroneous assumption does not affect the value of his mathematical demonstrations of the method of measuring the chords or lines inscribed in a circle, which, whether original or derived from his predecessors,

¹ Forbiger, *Handbuch d. Alt. Geogr.* I. p. 365 sqq.

² See Delambre, *Hist. de l'Ast. Anc. Discours Prélimin.* pp. XXV., XXVI.

³ This hypothesis of Ptolemy's was the established opinion till the time of Copernicus (who was born in 1473), and was partially revived by Tycho Brahe (born in 1546), who, however, supposed that the five other planets then known revolved round the sun, which, with these satellites, was carried round the earth every twenty-four hours.

Hipparchus, Menelaus, or Hypsicles, are beautiful specimens of Greek geometry. He shows that the obliquity of the ecliptic is $23^{\circ} 51' 20''$, and investigates the values of the arcs of meridians between the ecliptic and the equator, applying the principles of Menelaus. The *second* book deals with the problems connected with the determination of the obliquity of the sphere. In the *third* book he fixes the length of the year at $365\frac{1}{4}$ days and explains his celebrated theory of excentrics and epicycles.¹ The *fourth* book treats of the moon, criticising the results obtained by Hipparchus. In the *fifth* he describes the astrolabe of Hipparchus with which that astronomer discovered the moon's second inequality, called by Bullialdus the *evection*.² The *sixth* book treats of eclipsés. The *seventh* treats of the stars, with reference to their movement from west to east, which Hipparchus had established; but by reducing this motion from $48''$ to $36''$ in a year Ptolemy increases the error of his predecessor. In the *eighth* book he gives, with slight variations, the celebrated catalogue of the stars drawn up, as we have seen, by Hipparchus,³ and introduces also a description of the milky way. The *ninth* book treats of the planets in general; the *tenth* of Venus;⁴ the *eleventh* of Jupiter and Saturn. In the *twelfth* he gives us the progressions and retrogradations of the planets, and in the *thirteenth* he discusses their movements in latitude, and the inclinations of their orbits.

II. 'The four-booked syntaxis' dedicated, like the *Almagest*, to the author's brother Syrus, treats of astrological theories which are also the subject of 'the fruit,' (*κάρπος*) i.e. of his own books;

¹ See Montucla, *Hist. des Mathém.* I. pp. 292—298; Laplace, *Exposition du système du monde*, II. p. 401; Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences*, I. pp. 170 sqq., 182 sqq. Milton refers to the Ptolemaic theory in the following lines, *Paradise Lost*, VIII. 80 sqq.:

How they will wield
The mighty frame, how build, unbuild, contrive
To save appearances, how gird the sphere
With centric and excentric scribbled o'er,
Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb.

That he adopted the Copernican system may be inferred from vv. 122 sqq.

² Whewell, u.s. I. p. 229.

³ Delambre, *Hist. de l'Astr. Anc.* I. p. 183.

⁴ Delambre (u.s. II. p. 381) considers Ptolemy in this part of his work the fore-runner of Kepler, and therefore of Newton.

a collection of one hundred astrological aphorisms. These two books are generally known by their Latin titles *Quadripartitum* and *Centiloquium*, and some doubt has been thrown on their genuineness; but it does not appear that there are sufficient grounds for rejecting them.

III. An almanack or *Parapegma* of the risings and settings of the fixed stars calculated for five parallels—those of Syene, of Lower Egypt, Rhodes, the Hellespont, and the Euxine. The Greek title is: *φάσεις ἀπλανῶν ἀστέρων καὶ συναγωγὴ ἐπισημασιῶν*.¹

IV. A catalogue of sovereigns (*κανὼν βασιλέων*) with the length of their reigns from Nabonassar to Antoninus Pius.²

V. On the hypothesis of the planets (*ὑπόθεσις τῶν πλανωμένων*) dedicated to Syrus, and referring to the *Almagest*.

VI. Elements of harmonics in three books (*ἀρμονικῶν βιβλία γ'*), being a treatise on the musical scale.³

VII. 'On the analemma' (*περὶ ἀναλήμματος*), or the theory of the construction of sun-dials; and 'on the planisphere' (*ἁπλωσις ἐπιφανείας σφαίρας*), or the theory of stereographic projection, two treatises derived from an Arabic version.⁴

VIII. 'On the faculty of judging and the supremacy of the intellect' (*περὶ κριτηρίου καὶ ἡγεμονικοῦ*), a metaphysical treatise of no great extent or value.

IX. 'A system of Geography' (*γεωγραφικὴ ὑφήγησις*) in eight books, founded on that of Marinus of Tyre, on which Ptolemy, as the great mathematician of the age, had bestowed a thorough revision, and which he had extended by the results of his own researches. We have already mentioned that the greatest of modern mathematicians, Sir Isaac Newton, expended somewhat similar labour on an improved and corrected edition

¹ See Delambre, *u. s. I.* pp. 212, 213, who calls it a *Calendrier*.

² See Freret, *Acad. d. Inscr.* tom. XXVII. p. 121 sqq.

³ It is supposed that the treatise on music by Aristeides Quintilianus which has come down to us, and which is our most important Greek work on the subject, is anterior to that by Ptolemy, to which it makes no reference.

⁴ 'Ptolémée dans cette ouvrage fait partout usage des sinus, et ses constructions renferment trois des quatre théorèmes généraux de la Trigonometrie sphérique des modernes.' Delambre, *u. s. I.* p. LXVII.

of the general geography of Varenius.¹ Schlözer suggested² that Ptolemy's geography, in the form in which it has come down to us, is merely a compilation from different sources, based on the original work of the Alexandrian geographer. But there are really no grounds for this opinion, and the internal evidence shows that Ptolemy himself was the collector, compiler, improver, and editor of the work. The *first* book treats of the spherical form of the earth, of the parallels of longitude (μῆκος) and latitude (πλάτος), of the twenty-three divisions of climate, on the size of the earth, and of the mode of representing the map of the world, with converging arcs for the meridians of longitude, and concentric circles for the parallels of latitude. The *second* book describes the western half of Europe; the *third*, its eastern half; the *fourth* book contains the description of Africa; the *fifth* that of western,³ and the *sixth* that of eastern Asia; the first four chapters of the *seventh* book discuss India, the Golden Chersonese or the Burman empire, Siam, Ceylon, and Borneo, if this is meant by *Cattigara*;⁴ and the remainder of the *seventh* book, with the whole of the *eighth*, are occupied with a description of his general atlas or collection of maps.

Although it does not belong to the scope of this work to discuss the details of the Ptolemaic system of geography, it may be desirable to mention a few particulars respecting it. He assumed that a degree at the equator was 500 instead of 604

¹ Although Newton's edition is called *auctior et emendatior*, it does not contain any separate or distinctive additions from the editor's pen, 'and there is not even mention made of the polar compression of the globe, although the experiments on the pendulum by Richer had been made nine years prior to the appearance of the Cambridge edition' (Humboldt, *Cosmos*, I. p. 49, note).

² *Allgem. Welthist.* XXXI. pp. 148, 176. See on the other hand, Mannert, I. p. 174 sqq.

³ According to Stephanus of Byzantium, Ptolemy took particular pains with Arabia: ἀξιόπιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· σπουδὴν γὰρ ἔθετο ἱστορῆσαι ἀκριβῶς τὰ τῆς Ἀραβίας (s.v. Χαράκμωβα).

⁴ It is generally supposed that Cattigara is Succadang in Borneo. Some think that it may be identified with Canton in China, and that the river Cottiaris, near which it stands, is the Sihiang. On the antiquity of Ptolemy's myth about the unknown continent connecting Cattigara and Thinae with Cape Prasum, see Humboldt, *Cosmos*, II. p. 561, Otte's Tr.

stadia.¹ Taking then the parallel of Rhodes, he calculated the longitudes, from the Fortunate Isles to Cattigara or the west coast of Borneo, at 180° , conceiving this to be one-half of the circumference of the globe. The real distance is only 125° or 127° . So that his measurement is wrong by one-third of the whole, one-sixth for the error in the measurement of a degree, and one-sixth for the errors in measuring the distances geometrically. These errors, owing to the authority attributed to the geography of Ptolemy in the middle ages, produced a consequence of the greatest importance. They really led to the discovery of America. For the design of Columbus to sail from the west of Europe to the east of Asia was founded on the supposition that the distance was less by one-third than it really was.² In regard to the latitudes, Ptolemy was much more correct, for he was able to rely on astronomical observations. His four main parallels of latitude were those of Syene, Alexandria, Rhodes, and Byzantium, and the errors in regard to these are so small as to be quite insignificant. His calculations of latitude extend from the parallel of Prasum, a promontory of Æthiopia, about 16° S. latitude, to the parallel of Thule or Mainland, about 63° N. latitude. The geographical nomenclature of Ptolemy is of great value, especially in regard to the Asiatic names, which our increased knowledge of the old languages of India and Persia prove to be derived from a direct commercial intercourse between the west and the most distant regions in the eastern world.³ For example, he had not only heard the name of *Java*, but knew

¹ Mr. W. D. Cooley (*Claudius Ptolemy and the Nile*, London, 1854, p. 47) well remarks: 'in Ptolemy we see fully exemplified the genius of the Greeks, with whom the theoretical development of science far outstripped its practical application. . . . The scientific framework of his map, however admirable it may be for its bold anticipation of the capabilities of science, or as setting an example of a method which, when correct in its details, is invaluable, is in fact erroneous throughout,'—the cause of this being his 'fatal error in under-estimating the length of a degree.'

² It is curious that Prescott, in his account of the reasons which led Columbus to speculate on the existence of some land, probably the coast of China, beyond the Atlantic, does not say a word of the natural inference from the established geography of Ptolemy (see *Ferdinand and Isabella*, vol. II. pp. 200 sqq.).

³ See Burnouf, Yaçna, *notes et éclaircissements*, pp. XCIII. sqq.; Humboldt, *Exam. Crit. de l'Hist. de la Géogr.* tom. I. pp. 45—49; *Cosmos*, I. p. 559, note.

what that name signified.¹ His description of the *actography* or coast-lines of the world was necessarily very imperfect, but it was, in many respects, much more accurate than that of his predecessors, and he had obviously collected with great care all the hydrographic results of the most recent navigators. He was the first to indicate the true shape of Spain, Gaul, and the southern part of Britain; Ireland was no longer placed, as it was by Eratosthenes and Strabo, to the north of Britain, but occupied its proper situation to the west. He gave an eastern direction, however, to the north of Albion; he knew nothing of the Baltic as an inland sea; the Caspian extended in its greatest length from east to west;² Hindostan was contracted; Ceylon immensely exaggerated; and the gulf of Siam very much enlarged in its representative the *Magnus Sinus*.

The system of maps described at the end of Ptolemy's geography exists in some of the manuscripts of the work, in which they are attributed to Agathodæmon of Alexandria, supposed to have lived in the fifth century, and to have derived his materials from the maps drawn up by Ptolemy himself.³ These maps, which are twenty-seven in number, are elaborately coloured, the sea being green, the mountains red or dark yellow, and the land white. The extent of the geographical researches of Ptolemy is shown by the fact that he has defined the positions in latitude and longitude of nearly 5000 places, and that his book contains more than 7000 names, which is a much greater number than that which is supplied by any other ancient geographer. There are only 3300 names in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* and the Itineraries, and these are not defined astronomically.

As a writer, Ptolemy deserves to be held in high estimation; not only because he gave a clear and systematic account of the

¹ It meant barley-island, Ptolem. VII. 2: Ἰαβαδίου δὲ σημαίνει κριθῆς νῆσος. See W. von Humboldt, *über die Kawi-Sprache*, I. pp. 60—63, and A. von Humboldt, u.s. It is curious that *jawa*, which means both 'barley' and 'spelt' in Sanscrit, corresponds to the Lithuanian *jawai*, which means 'corn in general.' The Greek ζέφα is the same word.

² On the causes of this error, and on the services of Ptolemy in re-establishing the fact that the Caspian Sea was completely insulated, see Humboldt's *Cosmos*, vol. II. p. 560, Otte's Tr.

³ See Heeren, *Commentatio de fontibus Geographorum Ptolemæi, tabularumque iis annexarum, num ii Græcæ an vero Tyriæ originis fuerunt*. Götting. 1828.

science of his own and previous ages, but also because he stands in a representative position in regard to the lost works of his greatest predecessors. But for his honesty and candour we should have known nothing of the epochal labours of Hipparchus; in the 300 years which intervened between the age of the master and his great commentator, the discoveries of Hipparchus had not established themselves in public notoriety; they had a voice for the wise, as Pindar says, but to the general reader they needed an interpreter. Such an expositor they found in Ptolemy, who not only made known the results of the teaching of his predecessors, but preserved a record of their scientific renown.

§ 2. The Hippocratic school of medicine—which had been superseded in various parts of the Roman empire by the system of the *Empirics*, represented by Serapion, Archagathus, Asclepiades, Dioscorides, and others more or less eminent;¹ that of the *Methodics*, founded by Themison and Thessalus;² and that of the *Pneumatics*, which was maintained by Athenæus of Attalia³—was prepared for a revival by ARETÆUS of Cappadocia, who flourished towards the end of the first century. Belonging originally to the Pneumatic sect, he had joined the Eclectics, who had sought to combine, as far as possible, the principles of the divergent schools of medicine; and he not only followed in most particulars the practice of Hippocrates, but proved himself an observer of the same class. Indeed, it would be scarcely possible to exaggerate the merits of Aretæus as a describer of symptoms. His eight books ‘on the causes,

¹ The *Empirici* stood in direct opposition to the *Dogmatici*, or rationalists, who were the representatives of the school of Hippocrates. And as the latter held it to be necessary to inquire into the occult causes of disease, the Empirics maintained that nature is incomprehensible, and that we ought to be content with the results of practical experience.

² The *Methodici*, who took a middle course between the Empirics and the Dogmatics, held that the true *méthodos*, or way of proceeding in medicine, depended on an observation of symptoms and the adoption of an analogous treatment. Themison, who founded this sect, was a disciple of the Empiric Asclepiades. His new method did not relieve him from the old reproach of ‘killing his patients,’ and Juvenal makes it a long calculation to compute (X. 221):

Quot Themison ægros auctumno occiderit uno.

³ The *Pneumatics* sought the causes of health and disease in an immaterial principle (*πνεῦμα*), instead of the atoms (*δῦγκοι*) recognized by the Methodics.

symptoms, and cure of acute and chronic affections' (περὶ αἰτιῶν καὶ σημείων ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν, in four books; περὶ θεραπειᾶς ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν, also in four books), have come down to us nearly complete, and are regarded as a classical work in all that belongs to the phenomena of disease. They are written, like the works of Hippocrates, in the Ionic dialect, and are remarkable for the elegant perspicuity of their style, no less than for the accuracy of their facts. The theory is, of course, liable to the usual objections on the part of modern science.¹

But the *Eclectics*, or, as they were also called, the *Hectics*, or *Episynthetics*, did not revive the *Dogmatic* school established by the immediate successors of Hippocrates; and the opposition of the medical schools continued until the latter half of the second century, when a physician, trained in the best discipline of literature and philosophy, came forward as an expositor and improver of the Hippocratic system, and established it formally in the position which it occupied during the middle ages.

CLAUDIUS GALENUS,² commonly known as GALEN, a name which is still familiar to the physicians of the East, was born at Pergamum, in Mysia, in the autumn of A.D. 130.³ His father, Nicon, a mathematician and architect of eminence,⁴ had given him a good literary education, and, when he was fifteen, he was placed under the care of certain philosophers belonging to different schools. At the age of seventeen he was suddenly, and in consequence, it is said, of a dream which appeared to his father,⁵ transferred from the study of the mind to that of the body of man. His medical education was carried on in his own

¹ The writer of these pages, some twenty years since, had occasion to read through Aretæus with a physician who was preparing a translation of his work, and was assured that the observations were in almost every case in strict accordance with the facts of the case, though the theory was more frequently wrong than right.

² The name Γαληνός, as Suidas is careful to tell us, is a synonym for Ἡσύχιος.

³ Clinton, *F. R.* I. p. 117, II. p. 289. The life of Galen has been written by Labbé (*Vita Claudii Galeni Medicorum principis*, Paris, 1660) and others. Dr. Greenhill's article in Smith's *Dictionary*, vol. II. pp. 207—217, contains all needful information respecting Galen and his works.

⁴ Suidas, s.v.: υἱὸς Νίκωνος γεωμέτρου καὶ ἀρχιτέκτονος.

⁵ *De Meth. Med.* vol. X. p. 609; *Comment. in Hippocr.* II. vol. XVI. p. 223; *De ord. libr. suor.* vol. XIX. p. 59.

country till A.D. 150, when he lost his father, and commenced a series of journeys for the purpose of hearing the lectures of the most eminent professors. He first placed himself under Pelops, the physician, and Albinus, the Platonist, at Smyrna.¹ After this he proceeded to Corinth, where he heard Nemesianus, and to Alexandria, where he received instruction from the celebrated anatomist Heraclianus.² From Alexandria he made a number of tours to countries which he mentions in his works, and in A.D. 158, he went back to his native place Pergamum.³ Here he was at once appointed surgeon to the school of gladiators, and practised as a medical man for six years, with great success and distinction.⁴ Some commotions at Pergamum led him to visit Rome in A.D. 164,⁵ but his stay of four years in the capital, though it added to his reputation, exposed him to so much envy, that he was glad to return to his native city, which he reached after a circuit through Italy, Cyprus, and Lycia, undertaken for scientific purposes.⁶ He had not been long at home before he was summoned by the emperors Aurelius and Verus, to join them at Aquileia.⁷ He reached their camp in A.D. 169, and when it was broken up by pestilence, Galen followed Aurelius to Rome, Verus having died on the way. He declined, on the strength of a supposed communication from Æsculapius, the emperor's invitation to accompany him on his German campaign, and remained in Italy as the body-surgeon of the young Commodus.⁸ His chief employment was as a writer on philosophy and medicine. The year of his death is not directly stated; but Suidas says⁹ that he lived seventy years, which would extend his life to the year A.D. 200, and he tells us himself¹⁰ that he prepared his celebrated medicine, called *Theriaca*, for the emperor Septimius Severus,

¹ *De Anat. admin.* vol. II. p. 217; *De ord. libr.* XIX. p. 16.

² *Comment. in Hippocr.* vol. XVI. p. 136.

³ *De Compos. Med. sec. Genera*, vol. XIII. p. 599: γεγονὼς ἔτος ὄγδοον ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰκοσι.

⁴ *Comment. in Hippocr.* vol. XVIII. part 2. p. 567; *De Comp. Med.* vol. XIII. p. 574.

⁵ *De ord. libr.* XIX. p. 15.

⁶ *De prænot. ad Epig.* vol. XIV. p. 623 sqq.; *De ord. libr.* XIX. p. 15.

⁷ *Ibid.* XIV. pp. 649, 650, XIX. pp. 17, 18.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Εβλω ἔτη δ.

¹⁰ *De Antid.* vol. XIV. p. 3.

about A.D. 199, so that he was probably living at the beginning of the third century.

If an author's eminence depended on the productiveness of his pen, few writers could vie with Galen. Besides 174 lost works, comprising 113 treatises on philosophy, 12 on general subjects, and 49 on medicine,¹ many of which were destroyed in his lifetime by the conflagration of the Temple of Peace, where they were deposited, Galen is the author of 82 undoubtedly genuine treatises, 18 commentaries on Hippocrates, and 19 fragments; and 18 works of doubtful origin are attributed to him.

We will not weary the reader with a catalogue of these numerous writings. It will be sufficient to describe the leading characteristics of Galen's literary and medical works, and to mention those of his books which have been most influential. It was Galen's object to combine philosophy with medical science, and he has written a treatise to show the necessity for this union;² and while in the former department he held a sort of eclecticism, making, however, Plato and Aristotle his chief authorities, as they were the principal objects of his studies, in the latter, he laboured to revive the principles of Hippocrates, and opposed himself directly to more than one of the medical sects by which the dogmatic system had been superseded. His favourite study was anatomy, though he was excluded from the use of the human subject, and obliged to content himself with dissecting apes. Of three great works which he wrote on anatomy, we have still one in nine books, which is full of interest.³ He has written a treatise on the human skeleton,⁴ but he was obliged to refer his readers to Alexandria, if they wished to see complete specimens. His treatises on the nerves,⁵ and on the veins and arteries,⁶ especially his demonstrations against Erasistratus,⁷ that the arteries contained blood and not wind,

¹ See the list in Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 463 sqq., or in Clinton, *F. R.* II. p. 289.

² *ὅτι ἄριστος ἰατρός, καὶ φιλόσοφος*, 'that the best physician is also a philosopher.'

³ *περὶ ἀνατομικῶν ἐγχειρήσεων βιβλία θ'.*

⁴ *περὶ ὀστέων, τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις*, 'on bones, for beginners.'

⁵ *περὶ νέρων ἀνατομῆς.* ⁶ *περὶ φλεβῶν καὶ ἀρτηριῶν ἀνατομῆς.*

⁷ *εἰ κατὰ φύσιν ἐν ἀρτηρίαις αἷμα περιέχεται.*

have been much praised by modern physicians. The work, in which he most distinctly places his philosophy by the side of his physiology, is his treatise in nine books on the opinions of Hippocrates and Plato,¹ where he examines the conclusions of Chrysippus and others on many points touching the connexion of mind and matter. In his own physiology, Galen rejected all speculative hypothesis, though his principles, after all, were theoretical and even imaginative. His system rested on the assumption that there were only three bodily powers—the vital energy of which the heart was the seat, the intellectual energy which resided in the brain, and the physical agency which he placed in the liver; and, like Hippocrates, he recognized four temperaments, derived from the four principal humours; namely, the sanguine, the phlegmatic, the bilious, and the atrabilious. His greatest medical works were the treatise in seventeen books ‘on the use of the parts of the human body;’² the essay ‘on the art of medicine,’³ which was the text-book and chief subject of examination for medical students in the middle ages, when it was known in barbarous Latin as the *Tegnum* or *Microtegnum* (*Microtechnum*) of Galen; the fourteen books ‘on therapeutic method,’⁴ known in the middle ages as his *Megalogegnum*, in which he defends his own dogmatic or Hippocratic system against the Empirics and Methodics; the ten books ‘on the composition of medicines according to the places,’⁵ which contained the pharmacopœia of Archigenes, and which is a text-book with the Arabic physicians under the name *Miramir*, or ‘the book of ten treatises.’ And the six books ‘on the parts affected.’⁶ His literary and philosophical works, most of which are lost, were not less important in their way than his medical treatises. As a commentator on Plato in particular, he occupies a very high place; and in what remains of his general writings, he has contributed in no slight degree to our acquaintance with the history of ancient philosophy. His style, though it exhibits many of the faults incident to the fatal endowment of fluency,

¹ περὶ τῶν Ἱπποκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος δογμάτων βιβλία θ’.

² περὶ χρῆσας τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ σώματι μορίων λόγοι ιζ’.

³ τέχνη ἰατρική.

⁴ θεραπευτικῆς μεθόδου βιβλία ιδ’.

⁵ περὶ συνθέσεως φαρμάκων κατὰ τόπους βιβλία ι’.

⁶ περὶ τῶν πεπονθόντων τόπων ς’.

is very good considering the author's age, a fact to be attributed to his philological study of the best authors. Galen had all the instincts of a linguistic scholar. He had not only studied his own language grammatically, but he had paid special attention to the graces of style; and one of his works is a reproduction in better diction of a treatise by Menodotus.¹ He was acquainted with several languages, and had particularly studied the Persian. On the whole then, some acquaintance with Galen is necessary, not only to the physician, who does not wish to be ignorant of the history of his own profession, as it was cultivated during the thirteen centuries when Galen's works were received as oracular authorities in the whole civilized world; but also to the student of philosophy, and even to the Greek philologist, who will derive from his writings forms and constructions undoubtedly of classical origin, but not to be found in extant books of the best period of literature.²

§ 3. Galen's contributions to the history of philosophy are liable to be overlooked in the mass of his voluminous writings; but another physician, who lived about the same time, and who belonged, as his usual cognomen denotes, to the rival sect of the Empirics, is known to us only as our best authority for the philosophical system of the Sceptics, and for the full account which he has given us of many other philosophical theories. SEXTUS EMPIRICUS flourished in the first half of the third century. He was the scholar of Herodotus of Tarsus,³ to whom one at least of the doubtful works of Galen has been attributed,⁴ and who flourished about A.D. 200;⁵ on the other hand, he was the teacher of Saturninus,⁶ and must therefore have belonged to the

¹ Γαληνοῦ Περιγαμηνοῦ, παραφραστοῦ τοῦ Μηνοδότου, προτρεπτικὸς λόγος ἐπὶ τὰς τέχνας.

² This is shown, *inter alia*, by the extensive use which collectors of facts, like Lobeck, have made of the writings of Galen. See e.g. *Paralipom.* pp. 317, 318.

³ He must be distinguished from Sextus of Chæroneia, the nephew of Plutarch, and tutor of M. Aurelius (Suidas, s.v. Μάρκος), who lived a little before the Empiric. When Suidas says (s.v. Σεξτὸς Χαιρωνεύς): ἦν τῆς Πυρρώνειου ἀγωγῆς, he seems to confuse the two writers.

⁴ The εἰσαγωγή ἢ ἱατρὸς, Galeni *Op.* vol. XIV. p. 674 sqq. The *δρου ἱατρικοί* (vol. XIX. p. 346) has also been assigned to Herodotus.

⁵ He is referred to by Galen, sect. II. comment. in VI. *Epid. Hippocr.* 42.

⁶ Diog. Laërt. IX. 87, 116.

period following that of the Antonines.¹ We know nothing of his personal history. But he has left us two works, which have come down to us in a perfect state, and which are a complete arsenal of sceptical reasonings. These two works are entitled, 'Pyrrhonian sketches, or, sceptical commentaries' (Πυρρόνεια ὑποτυώσεις ἢ σκεπτικὰ ὑπομνήματα), in three books; and 'Confutations of the positive philosophers' (πρὸς τοὺς μαθηματικοὺς ἀντιρρήτικοί), in eleven books. The first of these works contains a very complete and lucid account of the doctrines of Pyrrhon, and gives us incidentally a great deal of information respecting the schools of philosophy to which these doctrines were opposed. The other work begins with six books addressed to the professors of the encyclic sciences—namely (1) of grammar and history, (2) of rhetoric, (3) of geometry, (4) of arithmetic, (5) of astrology, and (6) of music respectively; the five remaining chapters are in fact a distinct work, which may be regarded as a supplement to the second and third books of 'the Pyrrhonian sketches;' they contain an answer to the more general philosophers, the seventh and eighth books being an answer to the logicians, the ninth and tenth being against the physical philosophers, and the eleventh against the moralists.² These two treatises are not only invaluable in the absence of other means of information; but they have great merit in themselves. The style is clear and simple, the topics well selected and well arranged, and the author's information exact and copious.³ Besides these works, Sextus refers us to the following compositions from his pen, which are now lost: (a) 'empirical commentaries' (ἐμπειρικὰ ὑπομνήματα);⁴ (b) 'commentaries respecting the soul' (ὑπομνήματα περὶ ψυχῆς);⁵ (c)

¹ Mr. Clinton says (*F. R.* II. p. 293): 'Sextus might have flourished and composed his works in the latter years of the life of Galen.'

² The separate parts of this second work are often quoted by their separate titles, *adversus grammaticos*, *adversus rhetoricos*, &c., as well as by their general title, *adversus mathematicos*, I. II. &c.

³ A good modern edition and translation of Sextus Empiricus would be a valuable contribution to the history of Greek philosophy. The writer of these pages possesses Porson's copy of the edition by Fabricius, which contains many corrections in the handwriting of the great English scholar, and shows that he must have studied the work with very considerable attention.

⁴ *adv. Math.* I. 61.

⁵ *adv. Math.* VI. 55, X. 284.

‘medical commentaries’ (ἰατρικὰ ὑπομνήματα);¹ and (d) ‘sceptical commentaries’ (σκεπτικὰ ὑπομνήματα).²

Besides the information respecting the ancient philosophical systems, which Sextus has given us indirectly and incidentally, a writer, who was nearly his contemporary, has drawn up and left us a complete biographical history of Greek philosophy. The age and even the personal identity of DIOGENES LAËRTIUS³ have been regarded as open questions. Besides the more probable opinion that his cognomen *Laërtius* indicates his birth-place *Laërte* in Cilicia, it has been conjectured that it refers to his connexion with the Roman family of the *Laërtii*.⁴ And, as Tzetzes calls him Diogenianus,⁵ a modern scholar has identified him with a Diogenes or Diogenianus,⁶ mentioned by Suidas as a grammarian of Cyzicus,⁷ and the real author of the great dictionary which bears the name of Hesychius. But this grammarian seems to have flourished early in the second century;⁸ whereas, Diogenes Laërtius quotes Plutarch,⁹ Sextus Empiricus,¹⁰ and Saturninus,¹¹ and speaks of the eclecticism of Alexandria as a recently established system,¹² so that he must have been at least as late as the time of Amelius and Plotinus. On the other hand, there is no evidence to support the hypothesis¹³ that he lived in the time of Constantine the Great. The lady of rank, for whose edification he composed the book,¹⁴ has been supposed by some¹⁵ to have been Arria, the friend of Galen; others conjecture that his patroness was Julia Domna, the wife of Septimius Severus,¹⁶ at whose request Philostratus re-wrote the life of Apollonius. The work is quoted by Eustathius as ‘the lives of the Sophists,’¹⁷ and we can believe that Philostratus and Diogenes were friends and associates; that they undertook, as joint labourers, to compose

¹ *adv. Math.* VII. 202, IX. 28.

² *adv. Math.* I. 26, 29, II. 106, VI. 52.

³ Διογένης ὁ Λαέρτιος or Λαερτιεύς, also Λαέρτιος Διογένης.

⁴ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 564, note.

⁵ *Chiliad.* III. 61.

⁶ Ranke, *De Lexic. Hesych.* p. 59 sq., 61 sqq.

⁷ s.v. Διογένης ἢ Διογενιανός, Κυζικηνός, γραμματικός.

⁸ Below, chapter LX. § 4.

⁹ IV. 4, IX. 60.

¹⁰ IX. 116.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Proæm.* above, LIII. §. 5.

¹³ Dodwell, *De ætate Pythag.* § 22.

¹⁴ III. 47, X. 29.

¹⁵ See Menage, *ad Proæm. et ll. cc.*

¹⁶ Reinesius, *Var. Lect.* II. 12.

¹⁷ Σοφιστῶν βίαι.

lives of philosophers and sophists; and that at one time the works were bound up together under one title. Now the lives of the Sophists by Philostratus are dedicated to Antonius Gordianus, and were probably written about A.D. 237. It would not be an unreasonable conjecture if we supposed that the first book of Philostratus, and the work of Diogenes, which concur very much in subject, were published in the reign of Alexander Severus (A.D. 222—235),¹ and that the lady referred to by the latter was Julia Mamæa, the mother of Severus, and the niece of Julia Domna.² This date will, at all events, harmonize with the other indications of the age of Diogenes Laërtius.

Besides the shorter titles which are given to the work of Diogenes—namely, ‘lives of the sophists’ (σοφιστῶν βίοι), as it is quoted by Eustathius; ‘philosophical lives’ (φιλόσοφοι βίοι), as it is given by Photius;³ and ‘philosophical history’ (φιλόσοφος ἱστορία), as it is cited by Stephanus of Byzantium⁴—it bears the following more detailed heading in the manuscripts: ‘concerning the lives, opinions, and sayings of those who have been celebrated in philosophy’ (περὶ βίων, δογμάτων, καὶ ἀποφθεγμάτων τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμησάντων). In its original form, it had an appendix of epigrams on distinguished men, called ἡ πάμμετρος from the variety of metres in which it was composed. This is entirely lost, with the exception of the specimens scattered up and down the book itself.⁵

Like the parallel work of Philostratus, the biographies of Diogenes are divided into two main classes, the one containing the philosophers of Ionia, the other those of Italy. The first class is derived from Thales, the second from Pythagoras. The Socratic schools, which belong to the first class, are subdivided

¹ This date is adopted on other grounds by Hermann (*Act. Philos.* I. p. 327 sqq.) and Brucker (*Hist. Phil. Crit.* II. p. 643.)

² The character of Mamæa would be as likely to prompt the wish for a history of philosophy as that of her aunt was to suggest the biography of Apollonius of Tyana.

³ *Cod.* CLXI.

⁴ s.v. Δρυῖδαι: Λαέρτιος Διογένης ἐν φιλοσόφῳ ἱστορίᾳ. s.v. Ἐβεροι. s.v. Χολλεῖδαι. Διογένης ὁ Λαερτιεύς ἐν τρίτῳ φιλοσόφου ἱστορίᾳ.

⁵ Tzetzes quotes an epigram by Diogenes on Democritus in the passage cited above, *Chil.* III. 61, v. 996 sqq., where he calls the writer ἐπιγραμματογράφος τις. In the margin of cod. A, ὁ Διογενιανὸς is written to show whom he means.

into three groups of philosophers: (a) Plato and the Academicians; (b) Aristotle and the Peripatetics; (c) the Cynics and the Stoics.

Epicurus is placed at the end of the second class, as distinct from the Socratic schools, with which he was certainly connected through Aristippus and the Cyrenaics; and Diogenes bestows more attention upon him than on any other philosopher. In the editions, the work appears in ten books, in which the different lives are thus arranged: I. *Thales, Solon, Chilon, Pittacus, Bias, Cleobulus, Periander, Anacharsis, Myson, Epimenides, Pherecydes*; II. *Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, Socrates, Xenophon, Æschines, Aristippus, Phædon, Euclides of Megara, Diodorus Cronus, Stilpon, Criton, Timon, Glaucon, Simmias, Cebès, Menedemus of Eretria*; III. *Plato*; IV. *Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemon, Crates of Tarsus, Crantor, Arcesilaus, Bion, Lacydes, Carneades, Cleitomachus*; V. *Aristotle, Theophrastus, Straton, Lycon, Demetrius Phalereus, Heracleides Ponticus*; VI. *Antisthenes, Diogenes of Sinope, Monimus, Onesicritus, Crates of Thebes, Metrocles, Hipparchus, Menippus, Menedemus the Cynic*; VII. *Zeno of Citium, Ariston of Chios, Herillus, Dionysius of Heraclea, Cleanthes, Sphærus, Chrysippus*; VIII. *Pythagoras, Empedocles, Epicharmus of Cos, Archytas, Alcmaeon, Hippasus of Metapontum, Philolaus, Eudoxus of Cnidus*; IX. *Heracleitus, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Melissus, Zenon of Elea, Leucippus, Democritus, Protagoras, Diogenes of Apollonia, Anaxarchus of Abdera, Pyrrhon, Timon of Phlius*; X. *Epicurus*.

This work of Diogenes, though invaluable to the historian of philosophy, in the want of better materials, has but little merit either literary or philosophical. Its style, as Menage¹ and Salmasius² have observed, is deformed by vulgar idioms; and Bayle³ has directed attention to a frequent ambiguity and obscurity, arising from a want of clear conceptions. The book is full of inaccuracies, errors, and careless repetitions. The compiler is more anxious to string together unconnected anecdotes and good sayings for the amusement of superficial readers,

¹ pp. 253, 255.

² *De lingua Hellenistica*, p. 107.

³ *Dictionnaire*, tom. II. p. 1258.

than to furnish us with a methodical sketch of philosophical systems. If he had given us in all the lives the same amount of original materials as in his life of Epicurus, the value of his poor compilation would have been much enhanced. But unsatisfactory as this work is, considered as a substitute for the lost books of the Alexandrian writers, it seems that it was more complete in the middle ages than it is now. An English writer of the fourteenth century, Walter Burley, published a work *De Vitâ et Moribus Philosophorum*, in which he seems to have derived his materials from a more complete manuscript of Diogenes than any which is now known; for he not only gives us better readings, but supplies many deficiencies in the existing text, and cites a number of anecdotes and apophthegms not to be found in Diogenes, but evidently derived from him.¹

§ 4. From the time of Polybius, the Greek writers had taken a great interest in the military tactics by which the Macedonians and Romans had effected conquests in the outer world, as extensive as those which the Greeks had accomplished in the domain of philosophy and literature. The earliest work on tactics was that of ÆNEAS, whom some have supposed² to be a contemporary of Xenophon, and whose treatise was epitomized by the orator Cincas.³ Of the tacticians subsequent to Polybius, the most noted was ONOSANDER, who flourished in the middle of the first century of our æra, and dedicated to Q. Veranius Nepos, consul in A.D. 49,⁴ a brief but comprehensive treatise on the military art, which has come down to us, with the title *στρατηγικὸς λόγος*. It is divided into forty-two chapters, and gives instructions with regard to all the details of a campaign. It is written in Attic Greek, and in a sufficiently pure style. The author, who was also known as a commentator on Plato,⁵

¹ Schneider, in Wolf's *Analecten*, III. pp. 227 sqq.

² Casaubon, *ad Æneæ Poliorcet.* p. 30 (*ad fin.* Polyb.). There are two Stymphalians of this name mentioned by Xenophon—one who is killed in the retreat of the Ten Thousand (*Anab.* IV. 7, § 13), and another who distinguishes himself at the battle of Mantinea nearly forty years afterwards (*Hellen.* VII. 3, § 1).

³ Ælian *Tact.* I, Cicero, *ad divers.* IX. 25. This Æneas wrote a much larger work than that which has come down to us. It was on the duties of a general. See Polybius, X. 44, § 1; Suidas, s.v.

⁴ Tacit. *Annal.* XII. 5.

⁵ Suidas, s.v.: 'Ονόσανδρος φιλόσοφος Πλατωνικός. τακτικά, περὶ στρατηγημάτων.

was the source of the military writings of the emperors Mauritianus and Leo, and in a French translation was used as a manual of the military art by Maurice of Saxony. Arrian, as we have seen, his contemporary Ælian, and his patron the Emperor Hadrian, were also writers on tactics. And the Macedonian rhetorician POLYÆNUS¹ produced in the reign of M. Aurelius an elaborate work in eight books, entitled *Stratagems* (στρατηγηματικά), which is chiefly valuable as a collection of military anecdotes, though it also gives examples of successful deceit in civil and political life. It belongs to the class of *Ana*, and records the gossiping recollections of an elderly man, who had spent his life in literature and public business. From the dedication of the work to the emperors Aurelius and Verus, at that time engaged in the Parthian war, A.D. 163, we learn that the author had been excused from accompanying them on account of his old age,² but we are not told in what capacity he would have been attached to the court or camp. The *Stratagems* have not come down to us complete. There are gaps in the sixth and eighth books; and of the 900 stratagems, which he professes to have narrated,³ we have only 833. The style is perspicuous, lively, and agreeable, though the narratives are here and there obscured by their conciseness and excessive brevity. He sometimes imitates directly the phraseology of Herodotus and Thucydides,⁴ and must have been a man of extensive reading, as indeed he expressly tells in the preface to his second book. In addition to the *Stratagems*, he seems to have written three books on *Tactics* (τακτικὰ βιβλία γ'),⁵ a treatise on Thebes (περὶ Θηβῶν),⁶ and on his native country Macedon (ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων),⁷ and an essay on the Senate (ὑπὲρ τοῦ συνεδρίου);⁸ and he intended, at all events, to write the memoirs of Aurelius and Verus.⁹

ὑπομνήματα εἰς τὰς Πλάτωνος πολιτείας. The last named work probably commented on the *Laws* as well as the *Republic*.

¹ Suidas: Πολύανος, Μακεδών, ῥήτωρ. Cf. Polyænus, *Strateg. Præf.* II. et VIII.

² *Strateg. Præf. libr. I*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 321, Harl.

³ *Strateg. Præf. libr. I. ad fin.*

⁴ Kronbiegel, *De dictionis Polyæneæ virtutibus et vitiis*, Lips. 1740, pp.

9 sqq.

⁵ Suidas, s. v.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Stobæus, *Florileg.* XLI. § 53, vol. II. p. 90, Meineke.

⁸ *Id. ibid.* § 41. p. 87.

⁹ *Strateg. Præf. libr. VI.*

§ 5. Among the literary collectors or compilers of *Ana* in general, we must class the eminent Christian writer SEXTUS JULIUS AFRICANUS, who is known, like Polyænus, as a writer on military tactics. He flourished at the beginning of the third century, and is called by Suidas a native of Libya;¹ he resided, however, a great part of his life at Emmaus, in Palestine, where, according to some authorities, he was born,² and his surname may have been due to the fact that he eventually settled at Alexandria, and became bishop there. Besides a letter to Origen, on the apocryphal book of Susanna,³ and a chronology of the world in five parts (πενταβίβλιον χρονολογικόν), from the Creation, which he places in B.C. 5499, down to A.D. 221,⁴ Africanus wrote a great miscellaneous work, according to Syncellus,⁵ in nine books, but extending to fourteen books according to Photius,⁶ and to twenty-four books according to Suidas,⁷ which he called 'the girdles' (κεστοί), from the charmed girdle of Venus, which bound together and harmonized the discordant elements of the universe.⁸ It seems to have been the note-book of his knowledge on all the subjects which he had ever studied—botany, medicine, economy, chemistry, zoology, mathematics, military tactics, agriculture, and so forth. The only portion of this work which has come down to us,⁹

¹ Suidas: Ἀφρικανὸς ὁ Σέκτος (some read Σέξτος, Eudocia has Σέκτωρ, and Valesius proposes Κέστος), φιλόσοφος Λίβυς. The idea that he was a Libyan may have been suggested by his name, *Africanus*.

² Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 63.

³ Origen replied to this letter, and both tracts are extant. See Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, II. p. 111.

⁴ The fragments of this work are collected by Routh in the third vol. of his *Reliquiæ Sacræ*. See Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, II. pp. 456 sqq.; Bunsen, *Ægypten*, I. pp. 110 sqq., 245—251.

⁵ *Chron.* p. 359. This view is maintained by Lambecius, *Comment. de Biblioth. Cæs.* VII. p. 200.

⁶ *Cod.* XXXIV.

⁷ s.v. Ἀφρικανός, where we have, perhaps, only a false reading for the number given by Photius.

⁸ Hom. *Il.* XIV. 214—217. Cf. Plut. *Moralia*, p. 19 F: τὴν περὶ κεστὸν γοητείαν with Suidas's description of the κεστοί of Africanus: εἰς δὲ οἶονεῖ φυσικά, ἔχοντα ἐκ λόγων τε καὶ ἐπαοιδῶν καὶ γραπτῶν τινῶν χαρακτήρων ἰάσεις τε καὶ ἀλλοίων ἐνεργεῖων.

⁹ It is supposed that some portions of the book are still in MS. Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* IV. p. 240.

probably in an extract of the eighth century, refers to the military art, and has been published with other memoirs of the same kind by Guichard, the Q. Icilius of Frederic the Great.¹

§ 6. The caprice of fortune, which has deprived us of the collections of Africanus, has transmitted a similar work, perhaps less valuable, by his contemporary, CLAUDIUS ÆLIANUS, of Præneste. Although a native of Italy, which, according to Philostratus,² he had hardly ever quitted, he had acquired a complete mastery over the Greek language, and spoke Attic with such fluency,³ that he got the epithet ‘honey-tongued’ (ὁ μελίγλωσσος, ὁ μελίφθογγος).⁴ He practised as a teacher of rhetoric or sophist (ἑσοφίστευσεν) at Rome, in the time of Alexander Severus, as it seems,⁵ and died at the age of sixty.⁶

The extant works of Ælian are, ‘miscellaneous inquiries,’ (ποικίλη ἱστορία, or ἀφήγησις⁷) in fourteen books, and ‘on the peculiarities of animals’ (περὶ ζώων ιδιότητος), in seventeen books. The former is a collection of *Ana*, containing anecdotes of every kind, historical, biographical, antiquarian, put together without any method or connexion, and, perhaps, not intended for publication. The value of the book to us is occasioned by the loss of the original writings from which it is compiled. The seventeen books on natural history belong to the same class, being scraps and fragments of his own observations, or derived from information which he had picked up from books or hearsay. This book, at all events, was prepared for publication, for he justifies his want of plan in an epilogue.⁸ The two books taken together, might have corresponded in subject matter to a large part of ‘the girdles’ of Africanus. But while the only extant section of the latter refers to military tactics, we must be careful to distinguish Ælian

¹ *Antiqu. Milit.* Berlin, 1774.

² *Vit. Soph.* II. 31, § 3, p. 625, Olear.

³ *Id.* p. 629 : ἡττικίζεν ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν μεσογαλίᾳ Ἀθηναῖοι.

⁴ Suid. s.v.

⁵ According to Perizonius, in his preface to Ælian. Suidas says merely that he lived ‘in the times after Hadrian’ (ἐπὶ τῶν μετ’ Ἀδριανὸν χρόνων), which the writer in Smith’s *Dictionary* (vol. I. p. 28) inadvertently translates, ‘in the time of Hadrian,’ though he was aware that the κατηγορία τοῦ γύννιδος was probably aimed at Elagabalus.

⁶ Philostratus, p. 625.

⁷ Suidas, s.v. ἀσελγεία.

⁸ p. 396, ed. F. Jacobs, Jenæ, 1832 : οἶδα δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖνα οὐκ ἐπαινέσονται τινες, εἰ μὴ καθ’ ἑκάστον τῶν ζώων ἀπέκριναι μοι τὸν λόγον, ἡγὰρ ἰδίᾳ τὰ ἐκάστων εἶπον ἀθρόα, ἀνέμιξα δὲ καὶ τὰ ποικίλα ποικίλως κ.τ.λ.

of Præneste from the tactician of that name who flourished in the reign of Hadrian.¹

Besides these well-known works, Ælian is stated to have written three books 'on Providence' (περὶ προνοίας),² one 'on the divine manifestations' (περὶ θεῶν ἐναργειῶν) against the Epicureans.³ Twenty letters on agricultural subjects (ἀγροικικαὶ ἐπιστολαί)⁴ are also attributed to him, and he is said to have been the author of an attack on the effeminate character of the emperor Elagabalus (κατηγορία τοῦ γύνιδος).⁵

§ 7. By far the most important of the literary collections, which we owe to the diligence of the later Greeks, is the work of ATHENÆUS of Naucratis in Egypt, which is called 'the learned guests' (δειπνοσοφισταί), and was published in the reign of Alexander Severus, before the completion of Ælian's 'miscellaneous inquiries', in which there are several tacit references to Athenæus,⁶ and after the death of the jurist Ulpian in A.D. 228.⁷ Of Athenæus himself we only know that he enjoyed a very great reputation as a grammarian, rhetorician, sophist, and philosopher;⁸ and that besides the work of which we have to speak, he wrote a history of the Syrian kings (περὶ τῶν τῆς Συρίας βασιλέων),⁹ and an essay on a little fish called the *thratta* or *thatta*, mentioned in a comedy of Archippus (περὶ τῶν παρὰ Ἀρχίππῳ ἐν Ἰχθύσι τῷ δράματι θραττῶν).¹⁰ From his native Naucratis he went to Alexandria, where he spent the best part of his life, and which he regarded as his second home. In his later years he seems to have come to Rome, where he probably put the results of his Alexandrian

¹ Perizonius, u.s.; see Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* V. p. 621.

² Suidas, s.vv. ἀβασάνιστος, ἀγνώτας, and in other passages where the critics have recognized fragments, though the book is not mentioned.

³ Suidas, s.vv. ἀνεμάξατο, ἐνστάτης, καλλιγόλας, ὠψίσθης. The writer in Smith's *Dictionary* gives the wrong reading, ἐνεργειῶν, with the correct interpretation.

⁴ The title is ἐκ τῶν Αἰλιανοῦ ἀγροικικῶν ἐπιστολῶν. They are supposed to be written by Athenian husbandmen, as the last letter intimates (p. 650, ed. Gesner, 1566): εἰ δὲ σοφώτερα ταῦτα ἐπέσταλται σοι ἢ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἀγρων χορηγίαν, μὴ θαυμάσης. οὐ γὰρ ἐσμέν οὔτε Λιβυες οὔτε Λυδοί, ἀλλ' Ἀθηναῖοι γεωργοί.

⁵ Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* II. 31.

⁶ These references are given by Schweighæuser, *Præf.* p. VII.

⁷ See Schweighæuser's note in *Athen.* I. p. 1 E; *Animadv.* p. 19.

⁸ Schweigh. *Præf.* p. VI.

⁹ *Athen.* V. p. 211 A.

¹⁰ VII. p. 329 B.

labours into the form in which they have come down to us. The period of his death and his age when he died are altogether unknown.

The *Deipnosophists* or 'learned guests'¹ of Athenæus is a polyhistorical work chiefly made up of extracts from books in the library of Alexandria, and put into the form of a dialogue or series of dialogues, supposed to have been carried on in the house of a learned and opulent Roman named Larensius or Laurentius, during an entertainment prolonged through many days.² The guests are twenty-nine in number, and not only draw upon their memory for quotations suggested by incidents of the feast, but are expected by their entertainer to come furnished with excerpts from the best authors,³ which are produced and read when the occasion offers. This machinery enables Athenæus to give a sort of framework and external coherency to the carefully arranged contents of his note book,⁴ but, as in the well known English books called 'the Doctor' and 'the Pursuits of Literature,' the ventilation of the author's learning is the main object of the book. The work begins, like several of Plato's dialogues, with a conversation between Athenæus and a friend of his, one Timocrates, to whom he narrates 'the discourses of the learned men,' with all their quotations and extracts; and he sometimes interrupts the supposed dialogue, in order to address himself directly to Timocrates. Among the supposed guests are some of the most eminent men of the day; especially Masurius Sabinus, a descendant of the great jurist of the Augustan age, and himself one of the leading lawyers in the reign of Alexander Severus, Ulpian, whose death is supposed to take place soon after the entertainment,⁵ and Galen of Pergamum 'who has published so many writings on philosophy and medicine, as to surpass all his predecessors; and who is equal

¹ Schweigh. *Præf.* p. VIII.: 'Δειπνοσοφισταί, quasi diceret, *eruditi viri cœnantes, vel convivales doctorum virorum sermones.*'

² This is proved by the following passages: V. *ad fin.*; VIII. 331 B; X. *ad fin.*; XI. *init.*; XIV. 613 D, E, 623 F; XV. 665 A.

³ Cf. I. 4 B, VII. 277 B.

⁴ He says himself—for the artificial phraseology is hardly that of the epitomator—καὶ ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομία μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου πολυτελείας ἢ βίβλου διασκευῇ τῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ παρασκευῆς (I. p. 1 B).

⁵ XV. p. 686 C.

in style to any of the ancients.¹ These 'learned guests' pour forth an unbroken stream of quotations extending through fifteen books, and touching on every subject, which could be suggested by a banquet, and many others, which are brought in by the head and shoulders, so that the work is a complete treasure of information on Greek literature, especially poetry, natural history, medicine, public and social usages, philology and grammar. The authors quoted by Athenæus are about 800, of whom about 700 would have been unknown but for him; and he sometimes gives us as many as 50 quotations from one author. The titles of books, which he mentions, are about 2500, and he tells us himself,² that he had made extracts from more than 800 comedies belonging to the period of the middle comedy only. The extent to which this one book has contributed to repair the ravages of time, and especially to save choice fragments from the wreck of the great Alexandrian Museum, in which Athenæus pursued his studies, is shown by the test, to which Schweighæuser appeals,³ namely, that if we look into any collection of the fragments of Greek poets, we shall see how large a proportion is due to the *Deipnosophists*. Even in his own time, and in the ages immediately following, this work was regarded as a text-book by polyhistor, scholiast and grammarians. It is frequently adduced even by Ælian,⁴ who must have been a contemporary of Athenæus; Sopater, the sophist, cites it at the beginning of the fourth century;⁵ it is quoted by Harpocration,⁶ Macrobius,⁷ Stephanus of Byzantium,⁸ and Eustathius;⁹ it seems to have been used by Hesychius¹⁰ and the author of the *Etymologicum Magnum*;¹¹ and there are nearly a

¹ I. p. 2 E: Γαλήνης ὁ Περγαμῆνος, ὃς τοσαύτ' ἐκδέδωκε συγγράμματα, φιλόσοφά τε καὶ λατρικά, ὥς πάντας ὑπερβαλεῖν τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν οὐδενὸς ὧν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀδυνατώτερος.

² VIII. p. 336 D.

³ *Præf.* p. X.

⁴ *Var. Hist.* I. 15, 26, 27; II. 18, 37, 38, 40, 41; IV. 22, 23; VIII. 7; IX. 3, 8, 9; X. 6; XIII. 6; XIV. 7.

⁵ Photius, *Cod.* CLXI.

⁶ s. vv. ἐγγυηθήκη, νάννιον, &c.

⁷ *Saturn.* V. 21.

⁸ s. v. Γάγγρα, Γαιτούλοι, Ἰβηρία.

⁹ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* I. p. 316 sqq. enumerates more than 200 citations from Athenæus in the *Commentaries* of Eustathius.

¹⁰ Schweighæuser, *Præf.* p. XVIII.

¹¹ There is only one direct mention of Athenæus in the *Etym. M.* s. v. βράβηλα.

hundred quotations from it in the *Lexicon* of Suidas.¹ Yet it seems to have become scarce and known only in epitomes even to students of the twelfth century, and an abridgment made in the fifth or sixth century is all that we have of the first and second books. The third book is also incomplete at the beginning. But the bulk of the work has fortunately come down to us entire, though, from the nature of the case, the poetical extracts of which it is in a great measure composed, are very often in a state of textual corruption, which has invited the best efforts of critical scholars.

¹ Schweighæuser, *u.s.* p. XIX.

CHAPTER LVII.

LAST DAYS OF PAGANISM.—HEATHEN RHETORICIANS AND
PHILOSOPHERS.

- § 1. Last days of heathendom ; rhetoricians and philosophers of the old school.
 § 2. Ulpianus of Emesa and Antioch. § 3. Themistius. § 4. Libanius. § 5.
 Himerius. § 6. The emperor Julian. § 7. Proclus. The end of heathen
 philosophy.

§ 1. **C**ONSTANTINE'S adoption of the Christian religion, and his establishment of the seat of government in his new city of Constantinople, may be regarded as concurrent causes of the rapid decline of the Greek language and literature in the fourth and following centuries. On the one hand, Christianity, instead of being the object of misrepresentation and persecution—instead of being regarded as a mere offshoot of despised Judaism, and being oppressed as a mischievous and obtrusive form of oriental superstition,—became the dominant religion of the state, and a profession of its tenets was regarded as the shortest road to influence and honour. As a consequence of this, the old literature, with its mythological allusions, and its constant references to the old polytheism, as a basis of arguments and illustrations, became less and less fashionable ; and though the more eminent Christian writers in the second and third centuries had started from a basis of heathen accomplishments, and though the most distinguished Christian rhetoricians of the fourth century had sought instruction in the schools of those who still professed the old creed of the Roman empire, the Greek poets, philosophers, and orators of the better periods gradually lost their attractions, and the studies of the Christian teachers became every day more oriental and less classical, till at last the old learning was represented by some singular example, like John of Stobi or the patriarch Photius. On the other hand, the advanced position of the new capital, on

the confines of Asia Minor, from which it was separated only by a narrow arm of the sea, and within immediate reach of the barbarous tribes who inhabited the countries watered by the lower Danube, rendered it particularly liable to that corruption of the court language which is found to take place when the general population of the metropolis exhibits a confusion of tongues. Greek, the official language of Constantinople, was spoken there, with very different degrees of corruption, by Syrians on the one hand, and by Bulgarians and Goths on the other. A great number of Latin words had been directly introduced, and the Latin language held its place by the side of the Greek, as a medium for laws and court ceremonials. Justinian published his code in the language of Italy; and as late as the tenth century, the acclamations prescribed for the imperial banquets were in Latin.¹ As, then, Christianity undermined the old classical literature, the polyglot condition of the capital deteriorated the language itself. But besides these general and more slowly operating causes, there were some special circumstances which accelerated the decadence of Greek learning. The great library at Alexandria, and the school which was established in connexion with it, were much damaged by Diocletian, and disappeared at the end of the fourth century, in consequence of the edict of Theodosius enjoining the destruction of the Serapion. The conquest of Egypt in the sixth century only completed the work of destruction, which had been more than commenced two hundred years previously. Justinian closed the schools of Athens; and the Arabs overthrew those which had begun to flourish at Edessa, Berytus, Cæsarea, and Antioch. There remained only the institutions of Constantinople itself, and of Nicomedeia, encouraged or neglected according to the character and tastes of the emperor for the time being, but more and more tending to subordination under the influence of the clergy, whose tastes were anything but classical. And long before the establishment

¹ Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De cærimoniis aulae Byzantinæ*, I. c. 75, and the note of Reiske, p. 109, quoted by Schöll, *Hist. Lit. Gr.* VI. p. 31. The following are some specimens: *μούλτους ἄνους βικτορέμ τε φάκιατ Δέους. βικτωρ σέμπερ ἔρις. βιβετε* (where it is doubtful whether this means *vivite* or *bibite*), *Δόμενοι ὑπεράδωρες, ἰν μούλτους ἄνους.*

of the Turks on the ruins of the Byzantine empire, Greek literature had ceased to claim any original or independent existence.

In the present chapter we propose to notice the rhetoricians and sophists or philosophers who made a last effort to retain combined traditions of heathenism and classical Greek. And in the following chapter we shall trace the counter-agency by which the professors of Christianity passed from a qualified adoption of Greek philosophy and literature to a neglect of both, or a decided hostility to them in all their developments. 'In this contest between the heathen sophists and the Christian scholars,' says a learned German writer,¹ 'one seeks in vain even the slightest trace of the grandeur which generally characterizes the victory of Christianity over paganism. Arrogance and coarse vulgarity were the weapons with which the parties contended: sharpened, on the one hand, by inordinate ambition and a short-sighted dependency on tradition; and, on the other hand, by unbridled fanaticism, and a total disregard for all scientific pursuits. The fortune of the fight was now on one side, now on the other, as the barometer of faith rose or fell at court, until at last the general victory of Christianity silenced also the heathen sophists. It is true that this contest had aroused Greece and Asia once again to a more active vitality; but it was, as it were, the last despairing blaze of the expiring flame; and the few better spirits, who stood forth from the mob of bawlers, were like crippled eagles, who strove in vain to soar upwards to the sun.'

§ 2. ULPIANUS of Emesa, who taught rhetoric first at his native place, and afterwards at Antioch, from which he generally gets his name,² flourished in the time of Constantine the Great, and deserves a special mention, as in some sort the head of this later school of sophists: for he certainly taught the Christian

¹ Westermann, *Gesch. d. Beredsamkeit*, p. 235.

² Besides his article on Ulpian of Gaza, the brother of Isidorus the philosopher, which he has extracted from the life of the latter by Damascius, Suidas gives us notices of two σοφισταί of the name, one whom he calls 'Εμεσηνός, the other whom he entitles 'Αντιοχεὺς τῆς Συρίας, παιδεύσας πρότερον εἰς 'Εμέσαν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ βασιλεία Κωνσταντίνου χρόνοις. There can be little doubt that 'the man of Antioch who had previously taught at Emesa' was merely 'the man of Emesa' migrated to Antioch.

rhetorician Prohæresius;¹ and it is probable that Libanius, who was a native of Antioch, was formed directly or indirectly under his influence. He wrote a number of rhetorical treatises and declamations.² His name is most familiar to modern scholars from its connexion with some extant scholia on Demosthenes, which are of little value, and which probably belong only in part to this eminent sophist.³

§ 3. THEMISTIUS, the most distinguished of the philosophical rhetoricians, was born early in the fourth century⁴ at some small town in Paphlagonia. His father Eugenius, to whom he refers occasionally in his declamations,⁵ was a philosopher of some eminence, and Themistius enjoyed at home the advantage of an excellent education, and had been familiar with the best philosophers from his youth. He also studied in the schools of Pontus.⁶ His earliest publication was a commentary on Aristotle,⁷ by which his literary reputation was established. It is not known where or how he passed his life before he settled at Constantinople, but he seems to have been a resident in Asia Minor and Syria, and to have been a professed teacher of rhetoric and philosophy. When Constantius was preparing for a new campaign against the Persians in A.D. 347, he spent some time at Ancyra in Galatia, and on this occasion Themistius addressed to the emperor the first of his extant speeches, entitled 'on philanthropy, or Constantius.'⁸ Soon after this he established himself at Constantinople, where he resided for some twenty years.⁹ In A.D. 357,

¹ Eunapius, *Vit. Prohæresii*, p. 107 : cf. p. 125.

² Combining the two notices in Suidas, we learn that he wrote treatises on the people of Emesa, Heliopolis, and the Bosphorus, and others, besides *προγυμνάσματα*, *λόγοι διάφοροι*, *μελέται*, *διαλέξεις*, and a *τέχνη ῥητορική*.

³ See the contemptuous remarks of F. A. Wolf in his edition of Demosthenes *adv. Leptinem*, pp. 210, 1, and of Böckh, *Publ. Econ. of Athens*, pp. 450. 526, 7.

⁴ Photius says (*Cod. LXXIV.* p. 163): *ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίου ἔτι νέος ἦν*. Now the reign of Constantius was from A.D. 350 to 361, and Themistius must have been at least as old as Libanius, who was born about A.D. 314, and whom some consider as his pupil, and his appointment to the senate in A.D. 357 is inconsistent with the supposition that he was then a young man.

⁵ One of his speeches is a funeral oration on his father (*εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα*).

⁶ *Themist. Orat. XX.* p. 234, A, B; XXVII. p. 332 sq.

⁷ *Orat. XXIII.* p. 294 sqq.; Photius, u.s.

⁸ *Orat. I.* : *περὶ φιλανθρωπίας ἡ Κωνσταντίος*.

⁹ *Orat. XXIII.* p. 298 D; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 791. He made journeys,

Constantius, in a most eulogistic letter from Milan, which is still extant,¹ named Themistius a senator, and we have still the oration (the εὐχαριστήριος),² in which the sophist returns thanks for this honour. We have also the two speeches which he was to have delivered at Rome, as one of a deputation from the Senate,³ but which his illness obliged him to transmit in writing. For these courtly efforts, he was honoured with two statues of bronze,⁴ and, in A.D. 361, raised to the dignity of prætor.⁵ His adherence to the old religion, no less than his literary talents, recommended him to the favour of Julian,⁶ whom he panegyrised in an oration which is lost.⁷ On Jovian's accession in A.D. 364, Themistius went with a deputation of the Senate to meet the new emperor at Dadastane in Galatia, and delivered before him a speech remarkable chiefly for a passage in which he exhorts the Christian successor of Julian to allow full religious liberty to all his subjects.⁸ His speech called 'the loving brothers' (φιλάδελφοι)⁹ was delivered before Valentinian and Valens in A.D. 366. The victory over Procopius gave rise to his speech 'about the unfortunate' (περὶ τῶν ἡτυχηκότων)¹⁰ in A.D. 367, in which he commends the clemency of the emperor. When Valens in A.D. 369 appointed his infant son to the consulship, Themistius addressed a speech to him in the form of 'an exhortation to the young Valentinian' (προτρεπτικὸς Οὐαλεντινιανῷ νέῳ).¹¹ The speeches 'on the peace' in A.D. 369, and on the tenth anniversary of the emperor's accession to the throne (δεκετηρικός), in A.D. 373,¹² also belong to the reign of Valens. In A.D. 377, Themistius visited Rome by the desire of Gratian, before whom he delivered a speech 'on the beauty of the emperor' (ἐρωτικὸς ἡ περὶ κάλλους βασι-

however, to Rome (*Orat.* XIII. p. 177 D), to Syria and Galatia (XXIII. p. 299 A) and to Nicomedia (XXIV).

¹ pp. 18—23, Hard.

² *Orat.* II.

³ *Orat.* III.: πρεσβευτικὸς; IV.: εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Κωνσταντίον.

⁴ *Orat.* XVII. p. 214 B; XXXI. p. 353 A.

⁵ *Cod. Theod.* VI. 4; Photius, u.s.; Fabricius, VI. p. 792.

⁶ *Orat.* XXXI. p. 354 D.

⁷ Liban. *Epist.* 1061.

⁸ *Orat.* V.: ὑπατικὸς.

⁹ *Orat.* VI.: Φιλάδελφοι ἢ περὶ φιλανθρωπίας.

¹⁰ *Orat.* VII.

¹¹ *Orat.* IX.

¹² *Orat.* X.: ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης. *Orat.* XI.: δεκετηρικός, περὶ τῶν πρεπόντων λόγων τῷ βασιλεῖ.

Λικοῦ),¹ which is a very fulsome panegyric. Two years later, we find him one of a deputation to Rome from the Senate of Constantinople, for the purpose of congratulating Theodosius, who had become the colleague of Gratian. His ambassador's speech (πρεσβευτικός)² is still extant. In the years 381, 382, 384, 385, he delivered other speeches before Theodosius or in his honour.³ And he was so much esteemed by this emperor that he was not only made Prefect of Constantinople in A.D. 384 (on account of which appointment he made two speeches still extant),⁴ but even intrusted, notwithstanding his Paganism, with the tutorship of Arcadius, when the emperor was starting for the West to oppose Maximus in A.D. 387, 8.⁵ How long Themistius lived after this we do not know, but it is probable that he died about A.D. 390, for we have no further particulars of his life.⁶

In his own age Themistius enjoyed a paramount reputation as an orator. He was honoured with the surname Εὐφραδής,⁷ 'the eloquent;' even the Christian controversialist Gregory of Nazianzus calls him 'the king of speeches' (βασιλεὺς τῶν λόγων);⁸ and Constantius used to say that 'the philosophy of Themistius was the glory of his reign.'⁹ In the style and character of his oratory he comes nearer to Dion Chrysostom than any of his contemporaries;¹⁰ but he is more minutely exact in his imitation of the older writers, and does not profess to be able to speak without preparation. Indeed, one of his speeches¹¹

¹ *Orat.* XIII.

² *Orat.* XIV.

³ *Orat.* XV.: τὴν ἡ βασιλικωτάτη τῶν ἀρετῶν; XVI.: χαριστήριος τῷ αὐτοκράτορι ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς ὑπατέας τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Σατορνίνου. XVII.: ἐπὶ τῇ χειροτονίᾳ τῆς πολιαρχίας. XVIII.: περὶ τῆς φιληκοίας τοῦ βασιλέως. From *Orat.* XVII. compared with *Orat.* XXXIV. 13, p. 42, ed. Mai, we learn that Suidas is in error when he says (s.v.): γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ παραβάτου, ὃς οὐ καὶ ὑπαρχος προεβλήθη Κωνσταντινοπόλεως. For it is clear that, though the appointment had been offered to him more than once before the reign of Theodosius, he had declined it.

⁴ *Orat.* XVI., XXXIV.

⁵ Socrates, *H. E.* IV. 32; Sozomenus, *H. E.* VI. 36; Nicephorus, *H. E.* VII. 46.

⁶ He speaks of his old age and infirmities in *Orat.* XIV., XV., XVI., XXXIV.

⁷ Schott, *Observ.* V. 9.

⁸ *Epist.* 139.

⁹ *Orat.* XXXI. p. 354 D: Κωνσταντίος ὁ κόσμον τῆς ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείας τὴν ἐμὴν φιλοσοφίαν εἰπὼν πολλάκις.

¹⁰ Westermann, *Gesch. d. Bereds.* p. 243.

¹¹ *Orat.* XXV.

is an answer to a person who requested him to speak extempore (πρὸς τὸν ἀζιῶσαντα λέγειν ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα), and he excuses himself on the ground that he does not possess the faculty. His declamations abound in the closest imitations of Plato,¹ and commentators have found many illustrations of that philosopher's phraseology in the pages of Themistius.² The chief value, however, of Themistius in the eyes of the scholar, consists in the abundance of his learned allusions, which often throw some light on the classical authors, or at all events suggest researches in matters of considerable interest and importance.³

Of the thirty-six orations of Themistius which were known to Photius, thirty-three have come down to us in Greek, and one in a Latin version.⁴ His philosophical writings were 'commentaries on all the works of Aristotle, accompanied by metaphrases conveniently abridged.'⁵ We have still those on the eighth book of the Physical Lectures, on the Soul, on the minor physical works, on the second Analytics, on memory, sleeping and waking, on dreams, and divination in the sleep.

§ 4. From his autobiography and letters, as well as from the numerous works which he has left us, LIBANIUS is better known to modern scholars than any sophist of the fourth century. He was born about A.D. 314⁶ at Antioch on the Orontes, of a distinguished family, and after receiving there some part of his early training, to which, however, he does not revert with much respect or gratitude,⁷ he betook himself to Athens, at the age of twenty, in the ardent hope of finding there all the teaching

¹ In *Orat.* XXXIII. p. 366 C, he speaks of himself as Πλάτωνι συνὼν τῷ θεσπεσίῳ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει συνδιατρώμενος.

² Compare e.g. *Orat.* XXI. p. 257 C, with *Resp.* VI. p. 485 C; *Orat.* XXII. p. 269 D, with *Resp.* VI. p. 485 D; *Orat.* XXI. p. 245 A, with *Resp.* VI. 488 C.

³ Such is the suggestive statement, *Orat.* XXXVII. p. 337 B, that tragedy originated at Sicily, and was completed by the Athenians: καὶ τραγωδίας εὐρεται μὲν Σικυῶνιοι, τελεσιουργοὶ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ ποιηταί.

⁴ *Orat.* XII. *De Religionibus*.

⁵ Photius, *Cod.* LXXIV. p. 163: τοῦτου τοῦ Θεμιστίου εἰς πάντα τὰ Ἀριστοτελικά φέρονται ὑπομνήματα· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταφράσεις αὐτοῦ εἶδομεν εἰς τὸ χρήσιμον ἐπιτετημηένas.

⁶ Fabricius adopts this date (*Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 750). Reiske, from a passage in Libanius, *De Fortunâ suâ*, p. 94, places his birth at 316, for he there calls himself 50 in A.D. 366.

⁷ Liban. *De Fortunâ suâ*, p. 6 sqq.

which he required. The account which he gives of his adventures in that university furnishes us with a curious picture of the state of learning in the fourth century.¹ The rival professors had press-gangs of students (χοροί), who had sworn allegiance to them, and who forcibly seized on all freshmen and carried them off to their own lecture-room. Although Libanius had determined beforehand which of the sophists he wished to attend, he was kidnapped, as soon as he entered the city, by the adherents of another teacher, from whom he was again seized by an opposition gang and obliged to take the oath to their master. In this thralldom he was detained for five years, when the riotous sophists were for a time displaced and he was promoted to one of the chairs.² But the expelled professors were eventually restored, and, after a short time, Libanius left Athens to seek his fortune in Asia. On his journey to Heraclea in Pontus, whither he was accompanying his friend Crispinus, he passed through Constantinople. Here the sophist Nicocles invited him to settle with the prospect of speedily obtaining the chair of rhetoric.³ Being obliged to return to Athens, in order to fulfil a promise, he was forestalled in his absence by a sophist from Cappadocia.⁴ He opened, however, a private school, which was so well attended that the Cappadocian lectured to empty benches,⁵ and endeavoured to rid himself of his troublesome rival by trumping up a charge of sorcery.⁶ Supported by the prefect Limenius, who was the personal enemy of Libanius, the public professors contrived to get their competitor expelled from Constantinople.⁷ Libanius established himself at Nicomedia in Bithynia,⁸ where he spent five of the happiest years—the spring or flower as he says—of his life.⁹ After two more attempts to settle at Constantinople,¹⁰ and after declining an invitation to Athens,¹¹ he at last, in A.D. 354, obtained from the emperor Gallus permission to retire to his native city

¹ See the paper 'on the school of Athens' (*Journal of Education*, vol. I. pp. 261 sqq.), where some extracts are given from the autobiography of Libanius.

² *De Fortunâ suâ*, p. 19.

³ *Ibid.* p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 25—27.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 29.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 30.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 31—36.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 36—52.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 38: τοῦτον ἐγὼ τὸν χρόνον, ἔστι δὲ πέντε ἔτη, τοῦ παντὸς δὲν βεβίωκα, ταῦτι δὲ σχεδὸν ἐξήκοντα, ἔαρ ἢ ἀνθος προσεῖπών.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 54 sqq.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 58 sqq.

Antioch,¹ where he spent the remainder of his days. The year of his death is not known, but he was alive in A.D. 391,² and it is not probable that his life was prolonged beyond the end of the fourth century. Although Libanius contrived, by his restless vanity and unaccommodating temper, to be in a perpetual ferment of controversy, he does not appear to have been really an unamiable man, and was never betrayed into violence or intolerant sentiments in regard to the Christians. He was, indeed, the teacher of two of the most eminent Christian sophists, Basil and John Chrysostom, and always retained their friendship. The emperors Julian³ and Theodosius⁴ admired his talents, and the former was one of his regular correspondents and appointed him quæstor. Although Valens was at one time unfavourable to him, he contrived to recommend himself to the notice of that emperor, and even induced him to make a law respecting natural children, for the express behoof of the rhetorician, who was living in concubinage.⁵

The extant writings of Libanius are very numerous.⁶ They are divided into the following classes: (a) Sixty-six speeches (λόγοι), including his autobiography, which he drew up in the sixtieth year of his age, but probably added to afterwards (βίος ἢ λόγος περὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ τύχης); (b) Fifty declamations (μελέται) on imaginary subjects; (c) Examples of rhetorical exercises (προγυμνασμάτων παραδείγματα) in thirteen sections; (d) Arguments to all the orations of Demosthenes and the life of that orator (ὑποθέσεις εἰς τοὺς Δημοσθένους λόγους καὶ βίος τοῦ Δημοσθένους); (e) Letters (ἐπιστολαί), and formulas of letters (ἐπιστολικοὶ χαρακτῆρες). Besides this large collection of remains, it is known that many writings of Libanius are still in manuscript.⁷ His speeches are valuable from the light which they throw on the history of his own age, and the literary and political life of the fourth century. His declamations

¹ *De Fortunâ suâ*, pp. 61—68.

² *Epist.* 941; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 753.

³ Eunapius, *Liban.* p. 135, Fr. 76. Boissonade, apud Suidam, s.v. Λιβάνιος. Libanius, *De Fort. suâ*, p. 87.

⁴ Liban. *De Fort. suâ*, p. 137.

⁵ Eunapius, *Liban.* p. 133; Libanius, *De Fort. s.* pp. 97, 125, 166.

⁶ There is a complete list in Westermann's *Gesch. der Beredsamk.* pp. 330—342. See also Fabricius, VI. pp. 760 sqq.

⁷ Westermann, *l.c.* p. 341.

are ingenious and sometimes amusing, but the subjects are often very absurd; for example: 'A parasite being invited to a dinner party, and, wishing to arrive quickly, having taken a horse from the hippodrome went to the house of the inviter; now there was an altar before the door of the court-yard, and the horse taking it for the turning-point in the course, galloped round and carried the parasite back to the place from which he started: having gone without his dinner, the parasite denounces himself on the following day.'¹ The rhetorical exercises are either commonplaces and general themes, as: whether marriage is desirable (εἰ γαμητέον);² or special discussions, as encomiums³ and vituperations⁴ of historical or mythical characters, comparisons of persons and occupations,⁵ what Medea would say when about to murder her children,⁶ and the like. The arguments to Demosthenes are very valuable, and appear in all the editions. And the epistles are interesting, both in themselves and from the eminence of his correspondents, among whom were included the most distinguished of his contemporaries, Julian,⁷ Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Dorotheus, Amphilochus, and others.

The style of Libanius is founded on a careful and continuous study of the best models, especially Demosthenes. Both in the choice of words and in the construction of his sentences he adheres to Attic propriety, and his faults are due rather to the artificial age in which he lived, than to any deficiency of taste or energy on his part. It is rather curious that Eunapius and Photius are at variance as to the relative merits of his speeches and declamations. The former says:⁸ 'his style in his declamations is altogether weak, moribund, and spiritless.' But

¹ IV. p. 150, Reiske: παράσιτος ἐπὶ δείπνον κληθεὶς, βουλόμενος θάπτον ἀπαντῆσαι, ἵππον λαβὼν ἐξ ἵπποδρόμου ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ κεκληκότος· βωμὸς δὲ ἦν πρὸ τῆς αὐλείου θύρας. νομίσας δὲ καμπτὸν εἶναι τὸν βωμὸν ὁ ἵππος, ἔκαμψε· καὶ συναρπάσας τὸν παράσιτον ἀπήγαγε· καὶ μέντας ἄδειπνος τῇ ὕστερα αἰᾷ ἑαυτὸν προσαγγέλλει.

² IV. p. 1058, Reiske.

³ IV. pp. 925 sqq.

⁴ IV. pp. 962 sqq.

⁵ IV. pp. 992 sqq.

⁶ IV. p. 1009.

⁷ An epitaph, in two hexameters, on Julian, is the only poetical effusion ascribed to Libanius; see *Anthol. Pal.* VII. 747, p. 535.

⁸ Libanius, p. 133: ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ περὶ μὲν τὰς μελέτας παντελῶς ἀσθενὴς καὶ τεθνηκῶς καὶ ἄπνους.

Photius declares¹ that Libanius 'is more useful in his fictitious speeches and exercises than in the others. For by excessive diligence and care he spoiled the natural and spontaneous grace and charm of his style, and subsided into obscurity, darkening many passages by parenthetical insertions, and others by the omission of what was necessary to the completeness of the phraseology. For the rest, he is in these a canon and rule of the Attic style.'

§ 5. The third of the contemporary pagan sophists of the fourth century was HIMERIUS, who was born at Prusias, in Bithynia, about A.D. 315,² that is, nearly in the same year with Libanius, and probably not long after Themistius. His father, Amelinias, was a rhetorician of some eminence, and after receiving his early training at home, he went to Athens, and there completed his education.³ For some years he was a travelling sophist like Aristeides,⁴ and displayed his eloquence and accomplishments in his own country,⁵ at Constantinople,⁶ in Macedonia,⁷ and in the Peloponnesus.⁸ He then established himself at Athens as a teacher of rhetoric, in which employment he gained great reputation.⁹ Among his scholars he counted Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, and it is said that Julian was one of his hearers during his stay at Athens in A.D. 355-6.¹⁰ At any rate, that prince had a great admiration for him, invited him to Antioch in A.D. 362, and made him his private secretary.¹¹

¹ *Cod.* XC. p. 210. The conclusion of this passage is perhaps Mad. Reiske's authority for her statement (*Præf.* p. XVII.) that the writings of Libanius 'tot exquisitis veneribus et Atticis elegantissimis nitent, ut Attici sermonis regula haberi possint.'

² According to Wernsdorf, in the introduction to his edition: *Vita Himerii Sophistæ*, p. XLIII.

³ He was probably a hearer of Prohæresius, whose rival he afterwards became; Suidas, s.v.: ἀντιπαιδευσας Προαιρεσιῶν ἐν Ἀθήναις. Cf. Eunapius, *Prohæres.*, p. 110.

⁴ Wernsdorf, p. XLIV.

⁵ Phot. *Cod.* CLXV. p. 108.

⁶ *Eclog.* XIII. ; *Orat.* XVI.

⁷ *Orat.* V. at Thessalonica, and *Orat.* VI. at Philippi.

⁸ At Corinth (*Orat.* XXXI.) and at Lacedæmon (Phot. *u.s.*).

⁹ Phot. *u.s.* p. 109.

¹⁰ Libanius, *Orat.* X ; Zosimus, *H. E.* III. 2 ; Wernsdorf, pp. LV. sqq.

¹¹ Tzetzes, *Chil.* VI. 46, 328 :

ἦσαν καὶ οὗτοι γραμματεῖς καὶ τῶν φιλοσοφούντων
ἐὼ τὸν Βροῦτὸν τε αὐτὸν καὶ τοῦτου γραμματεῖα,
ἐὼ Ἰουλιάνειον Ἱμερίῳ σοι λέγειν.

There was active rivalry between Himerius and the Christian sophist Prohæresius, and the former did not return to Athens after the decease of Julian, until Prohæresius also had been removed by death in A.D. 368.¹ He became blind in his old age,² and died of an epileptic fit³ in A.D. 386.⁴

Of the seventy-one orations of Himerius which were known to Photius, and from thirty-seven of which he has given us extracts, we have twenty-four complete, and ten more or less mutilated. Most of them are of the nature of epideictic harangues. Some have a special and historical reference; the majority are declamations on imaginary subjects; and, though exhibiting sometimes a good deal of spirit, especially that which he puts into the mouth of Themistocles,⁵ they are generally neither better nor worse than other productions of artificial rhetoric. Himerius is an imitator of Aristeides,⁶ and it may be said of him that he is not inferior to his model in refinement, dexterity, and learning. There is not much profit to be got from a study of his compositions, but the classical student will be pleased sometimes by the ingenuity with which he reproduces images familiar to the readers of the best authors.⁷

Although Photius speaks of Himerius as an insidious assailant of the Christians,⁸ it is clear that he was free from bigotry, and that he deserves the praise of moderation which is bestowed on his two most eminent contemporaries, Themistius and Libanius.⁹

§ 6. Among the pupils of Himerius we have mentioned one

¹ Eunap. *l.c.* p. 129; Wernsdorf, p. LI. sq.

² Suidas, s.v.: *πηρὸς τὰς ὄψεις ἐν γήρᾳ.*

³ Eunapius, p. 129: *τῆς ἱερᾶς νόσου πρὸς γῆρα μακρῷ καταλαβούσης αὐτῷ.* The author of the article in Smith's *Dictionary* (II. p. 472), perhaps misled by the article in Pauly, quotes Suidas for this fact.

⁴ Wernsdorf, p. XLIII.

⁵ *Eclog.* V.; Phot. *Cod.* CCXLIII.

⁶ Eunapius, p. 129: *παρὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀριστείδην ἴσταται.*


⁷ The following is a favourable specimen: Πειθῷ δὲ καὶ Πόθου καὶ Ἰμερος τὸ σὸν κάλλος ἅπαν ἐνείμαντο· ὁ μὲν ἐφίζάνων τοῖς ὄμμασι κάκειθεν ἐκπυρσεύων ἀμήχανον (cf. Soph. *Antig.* 781; Shaksp. *Love's Lab. L.* act IV. sc. 3), οἱ δὲ τὰς παρειὰς αἰδοῖ φονίσσοντες πλέον ἢ τὰς τῶν ῥόδων ἢ φύσις κάλυκας ὅταν ἡριναῖς ὥραις ὑπὸ τῆς ἀκμῆς σχιζόμεναι πετάλοις ἀκραις ἐρεύθωνται, Πειθῷ δὲ κατὰ τῶν χειλέων σκηνώσασα τὴν ἐαυτῆς χάριν συναποστάξει τοῖς ῥήμασι.

⁸ *Cod.* CLXV. p. 356: *ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτος ὢν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἀσεβῆς ὡς δῆλόν ἐστι τὴν θρησκείαν· εἰ καὶ τοὺς λαθραίους μιμεῖται τῶν κυνῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὑλακτῶν.*

⁹ Wernsdorf, *Vita Himerii*, § 14, p. LIV.

who was, perhaps, the most interesting man of letters in the fourth century. FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JULIANUS, generally known as 'Julian the Apostate,' was born at Constantinople, on the 17th November, 331, became emperor in 360, and fell in battle with the Persians, on the 26th June, 363. He was the son of Julius Constantius, and, consequently, nephew of Constantine the Great.¹ With his brother Gallus, he was rescued by Mark, the archbishop of Arethusa, from the massacre of the descendants of Constantius Chlorus, which was ordered by Constantius II., on his accession to the throne. Julian was then six years old, and his education was for many years carried on in seclusion.² The misconduct and death of his elder brother Gallus, in A.D. 354, brought Julian into great danger, which was averted by the interposition of the empress Eusebia,³ and Julian was allowed, or rather enjoined to retire to Athens,⁴ where he spent a few months in philosophical and literary studies. In November, 355, he was raised to the rank of Cæsar, married to the emperor's sister Helena, and made governor-general of the western provinces.⁵ His public life after this time belongs to Roman history, and nothing can be

¹ The following table will show his descent and most important affinities :



Julian's father, Julius Constantius, was twice married—first to Galla, by whom he had Gallus, the son murdered by Constantius II., and a daughter, married to that emperor; secondly, to Basilina, the daughter of Anicius Julianus, who died soon after giving birth to her only child Julian (*Jul. Ep.* 58; *Misopog.* p. 352).

² He and Gallus were imprisoned at Macellum in Cappadocia from A.D. 345 to 351 (*ad Athen.* p. 271; Sozomen. V. 2; *Ammian.* XV. 2. 27). Julian had previously made considerable progress in grammar and rhetoric under Nicocles and Ecebolius at Constantinople, whence he was removed owing to the emperor's jealousy of his acquirements (*Liban. Or. fun.* I. p. 525, Reiske; *Socr.* III. 1; *Sozomen.* V. 2).

³ *Ad Athen.* pp. 272—274.

⁴ Cf. *Jul. Orat.* III. p. 118 B; *ad Athen.* p. 273 D; *Liban.* I. p. 531, Reiske; *Ammian.* XV. 2. 8.

⁵ *Ad Athen.* p. 277 A; *Liban.* I. p. 532; *Ammian.* XV. 8, 17, 18.

added to the masterly account of Julian which Gibbon has included in his great work. Those who wish to know what Julian was as a general and a sovereign, will, of course, refer to the History of the Decline and Fall of Rome. It is our business to consider his character as the last and most eminent of the pagan sophists.

The extant writings of Julian are as follows:—

(I.) *Orations or manifestoes.* (a) ‘An encomium on the emperor Constantius’ (ἐγκώμιον πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Κωνσταντίον), which was probably a necessary sacrifice of his convictions to the duty of self-preservation. (b) ‘On the emperor’s acts, or on the monarchy’ (περὶ τῶν αὐτοκράτορος πράξεων ἢ περὶ βασιλείας), which is a valuable contribution to the history of the times, and gives an early proof of his tendency to paganism. (c) ‘An eulogium on the empress Eusebia’ (ἐγκώμιον Εὐσεβίας τῆς βασιλίδος), which no doubt expresses the feelings he really entertained towards his benefactress. (d) ‘On the royal sun’ (εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἡλίου), and (e) ‘on the mother of the gods’ (εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν), two allegorizing and enthusiastic discourses of the nature of pagan sermons. (f) ‘On the illiterate Cynics’ (εἰς τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους Κυνικούς), and (g) ‘against the Cynic Heraclius, on the duties of Cynicism, and whether it befits a Cynic to compose fables’ (πρὸς Ἡράκλειον Κυνικόν, περὶ τοῦ πῶς κυνιστέον, καὶ εἰ πρέπει τῷ Κυνὶ μυθοῦς πλάττειν), in which he discusses the principles of the Cynic system, as he conceived it, and illustrates, by an interesting example, the nature of the philosophical allegory.¹ (h) ‘A consolation on the departure of the most excellent Sallustius’ (ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ἀγαθωτάτου Σαλλουστίου παραμυθητικός), an affectionate expression of his regret when Constantius summoned from Gaul the prefect Sallustius, who had been Julian’s best friend and wisest adviser. (i) ‘An address to Themistius,’ in reply to a letter of congratulation and advice from that rhetorician. (k) ‘A manifesto to the people of Athens,’ in which he justifies his revolt from Constantius. (l) ‘A letter to a pagan pontiff,’ in which he gives instructions respecting the duties of the heathen priests.

¹ pp. 227—234: πλουσίῳ ἀνδρὶ πρόβατα ἦν πολλὰ κ.τ.λ.

(II.) *Satirical works.* (a) 'The Cæsars, or the banquet' (Καίσαρες ἡ συμπόσιον). This is a dialogue, somewhat in the style of Lucian. The deified Romulus gives a banquet to the gods at the Saturnalia, and invites the Roman Cæsars to the side-table. As these emperors appear, they are criticized by Silenus. M. Aurelius receives the highest praises, and Constantine the Great is severely censured. Alexander of Macedon also makes his appearance, and is obliged to concur with the other military sovereigns in acknowledging the superiority of a royal philosopher, like Julian, to a royal soldier, like one of themselves. Gibbon declares¹ that this philosophical fable 'is one of the most agreeable and instructive productions of ancient wit,' and that its value 'is enhanced by the rank of the author;' for 'a prince who delineates with freedom the vices and virtues of his predecessors, subscribes in every line the censure or approbation of his own conduct.' (b) 'The inhabitant of Antioch, or the enemy of the beard' (Ἀντιοχικὸς ἡ μισοπώγων). In the course of his residence at Antioch in A.D. 362, Julian was grossly insulted by the populace of that city, with the connivance of the magistrates. 'During the licentious days of the Saturnalia,' says Gibbon,² 'the streets of the city resounded with insolent songs, which derided the laws, the religion, the personal conduct, and even the *beard* of the emperor; but instead of abusing or exerting the authority of the state to revenge his personal injuries, Julian contented himself with an inoffensive mode of retaliation, which it would be in the power of few princes to employ. He had been insulted by satires and libels; in his turn, he composed, under the title of the *Enemy of the Beard*, an ironical confession of his own faults, and a severe satire of the licentious and effeminate manners of Antioch. This imperial reply was publicly exposed before the gates of the palace; and the *Misopogon* still remains a singular monument of the resentment, the wit, the humanity, and the indiscretion of Julian.'

(III.) *Epistles.* These are ninety-six in number, and are interesting both from the subjects and from the persons with

¹ *Rom. Emp.* III. ch. 24, pp. 179, 180, ed. W. Smith.

² Vol. III. ch. 24, pp. 184, 5, ed. W. Smith.

whom Julian corresponded. Many are addressed to the sophist Libanius and the Neo-Platonist Iamblichus, who represented the classical tastes and allegorizing tendencies of the emperor's own mind.

(IV.) *Poems*. We have only four epigrams, and of these the most characteristic is his attack on the beer of Gaul, of which he says that it ought to be called the offspring of Ceres rather than of Bacchus; that it was rather wheat-born (*πυρογενής*) and barley-bree (*βρόμος*), than brought forth like Bacchus, in the midst of fire and thunder (*βρόμος*).¹

We have lost one of the most important of Julian's works, his treatise, in seven books, 'against the Christians' (*κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*), which shared the fate of Porphyry's book, being destroyed by the order of Theodosius II., and which would have been altogether unknown to us, had not parts of it been preserved in the celebrated answer to it put forth in the following century by Cyril of Alexandria. This work was written at Antioch during the winter evenings, and was answered, as soon as it appeared, by Apollinarius of Laodicea.² It is said that the imperial advocate of paganism regarded the Christian apologist with no little contempt, remarking in a letter to some bishops, with disdainful levity, that he had perused it, used it, and refused it (*ἀνέγνων, ἔγνων, κατέγνων*). They wrote back, or, as some suppose, Basil replied: 'You have perused it, but you have not used it; for if you had used it, you would not have refused it' (*ἀνέγνως ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνως· εἰ γὰρ ἔγνως οὐκ ἂν*

¹ *Anthol. Pal.* IX. 368:

*τίς; πόθεν εἰς Διόνυσσε; μὰ γὰρ τὸν ἀληθέα Βάκχον
οὗ σ' ἐπιγινώσκω· τὸν Διὸς οἶδα μόνον.
κεῖνος νέκταρ ὕδωδε, σὺ δὲ τράγον. ἥ ῥά σε Κελτοὶ
τῇ πενίῃ βοτρύων τεύξαν ἀπ' ἀσταχύων.
τῷ σε χρή καλεῖν Δημήτριον, οὐ Διόνυσσον,
πυρογενῇ μᾶλλον, καὶ Βρόμον, οὐ Βρόμιον.*

In the last line there is a suppressed pun in *πυρογενῇ* tacitly opposed to *πυρογενῆς*, implied in the well-known fate of Semele, and *βρόμος*, according to Hesychius, is *σπέρμα λεπτῆς κριθῆς*.

² It is doubted whether this answer to Julian, was included in the answer to Porphyry, in thirty books, which Suidas, s.v. 'Απολλινάριος, mentions: οὗτος ἔγραψε καταλογάδην κατὰ Πορφυρίου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς τόμους Χ'. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 747.

κατέγνως).¹ The reply of Cyril is addressed only to the first three books of Julian's attack on Christianity, which were entitled 'the overthrow of the Gospels' (ἀναστροφὴ τῶν εὐαγγελίων). We do not know what was Julian's procedure in the other four books, but Cyril seems to admit that he had left some of his antagonist's strongest arguments unanswered.

As Julian was trained at an early age in the discipline of Christianity,² it has always been an interesting question why he reverted to the older paganism. It is hardly our business to examine this question at any length. But it is necessary to say as much on the subject as may suffice to connect the case of Julian with those of Porphyry and Iamblichus, which we have already mentioned. That there were many reasons why Julian should not look with much favour on the religion which had been adopted by his uncle Constantine, for whom he entertained little respect, and which was maintained by his cousin Constantius, whose treachery, hypocrisy, and cruelty he had experienced in so painful a manner, is sufficiently obvious. Nor was the religion itself presented to his reflecting mind in a very inviting form. He saw that its leading professors paid but little attention to the simple precepts of the Gospel, and showed scarcely any consciousness of the duty of leading a divine life in the world. On the contrary, in proportion as they were outwardly most orthodox, in the same proportion they nullified the vital principles of Christianity; and instead of loving as brethren, were ready to become the bitter foes of all who did not adopt some mysterious and incomprehensible formula which expressed the main theorems of their speculative theology. Having been led to despise as unphilosophical a creed which

¹ Sozomen, *H. E.* V. 18: εἰς δὲ οἱ Βασιλεῖς τῷ προστάτῃ τῆς Καππαδοκῶν ἐκκλησίας ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀνατιθέασι.

² Julian's first tutor was the eunuch Mardonius, to whose care of his morals he pays a warm tribute (*Misopog.* p. 351). The grammarian Nicocles and the rhetorician Ecebolius, who taught him at Constantinople before he was banished to Cappadocia, were both Christians, and during the period of his exile he was a zealous professor himself (Greg. Naz. *Or.* III. p. 58 D; Socr. III. 1; Sozomen, V. 2; Theodoret, III. 2). It was while he was staying at Nicomedeia, in A.D. 351, that he was first turned from Christian faith to heathen philosophy (Liban. I. p. 528, Reiske; Greg. Naz. *Or.* III. p. 61; Ammian. XXII. 5. 1 sqq.; Julian, *Epist.* 42).

appeared chiefly as a dispute between the Arians and the Athanasians, and which was derived from a despised Galilean, Julian found in his own temperament, and in the results of his educational training at a riper age, much that inclined him to the old faith of Rome and Greece, illustrated, as he conceived it might be illustrated, by the speculations of Neo-Platonism. Julian was one of those enthusiasts whose imagination seeks in the revival of the past a proper substitute and remedy for all that is unsatisfactory in the present state of things; he was one of those Quixotic spirits, who set themselves in opposition to the progress of their age, and vainly imagine that they can check it by giving new life and new forms to the mouldering relics of bygone beliefs and usages. On this account, an able writer¹ has called him 'romantic,' with the following illustration of the term: 'The name of romanticist has of late been given to poets who have striven to revive poetically, as the deepest wisdom, the defunct fable-world of mediæval faith; philosophical romanticists are those, who, by a fantastic admixture of religious ingredients, seek to provide for the philosophy, which criticism has made void, the substantial replenishment which they cannot produce by their own reflexions; the romantic theologian labours, by philosophical and æsthetical additions, to make palatable and digestible the stale theological cabbage; romantic politicians see in the re-awakening of mediæval feudality and chivalry the only remedy for modern constitutions; lastly, a romantic prince is one who, like our Julian, having been nurtured in the ideas and strivings of romanticism, has made an endeavour to transfer them to the domain of reality by means of a system of government.' The paganism, however, which Julian wished to re-establish instead of the contentious theology of the Christian church, was not the old faith of either Greece or Rome.² He looked upon that old mythology and polytheism with the eyes of a Neo-Platonist, and sought to extract from it philosophical conclusions of which his reason could approve by allegories³ not

¹ See '*Der Romantiker auf dem Throne der Cæsaren oder Julian der Abtrünnige*. Ein Vortrag von D. F. Strauss. Mannheim, 1847,' p. 18. This vigorous and learned pamphlet is supposed to be intended as a side-blow aimed at the present King of Prussia.

² Strauss, u.s. p. 23.

³ See especially the allegories about the sun-god (*Orat. IV. in reg. Sol.* p. 136

unlike those by which Philo and some of the earlier Christian fathers¹ had laboured to make the old books of the Jews immediately instructive and important to the rational believer. He did but adopt the old histories of the gods as the pictorial representation of his own conceptions. Manichæus had done the same, about a century before, with the dualism of the old Persians; and many Christians, both orthodox and heterodox, had been trying to use the records of their own religion as a sort of hieroglyphic writing which required to be transcribed into common characters. But with all this philosophy Julian was a religious man; or rather he had a superstitious reverence for the old gods. He really regarded the Christians as impious men and atheists, who had left the worship of the old-established deities, and gone over to one whom, in his profane blasphemy, he called 'a dead Jew.'² He actually maintained, like many modern romanticists, that a belief, however preposterous, must be received by all men, even philosophers, if it rested on a sufficiently long tradition, and had been adopted by whole communities.³ His philosophy did not prevent him from attaching a vital importance to the mystic rites, public sacrifices, and even to the extispicial auguries, which marked the most barbarous form of polytheistic worship.⁴ He, who rejected with scorn the evidence of the miracles of Jesus of Nazareth, was quite willing to lend a credulous ear to the theurgic wonders of Neo-

sqq.) Aphrodite (*ibid.* p. 150 sq.), Demeter and Attis (*Orat. V. in Matrem Deorum*, p. 166, 7).

¹ Compare what he says, *Orat. V. in Matr. Deorum*, pp. 169 D, 170 A, B, with the theory of Origen c. *Celsum*, I. 40.

² Julian, *ap. Cyrill. c. Jul.* VI. p. 194 D: ἀέλιως ἂν τις συνετωτέρους ὑμῶν μισήσειεν ἢ τοὺς ἀφρονεστέρους ἐλεήσειεν, οἱ κατακολουθοῦντες ὑμῖν εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθον δόλεθρον, ὥστε τοὺς αἰωνίους ἀφέντες θεοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μεταβῆναι νεκρόν. His regular name for the Christians is ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἄθεοι.

³ *Orat. in Matr. Deor.* p. 161 B: καὶ τοι με οὐ λέλθην ὅτι φήσουσιν αὐτὰ τινες τῶν λίαν σοφῶν ὕθλους εἶναι γραϊδίων οὐκ ἀνεκτοῦς. ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ ταῖς πόλεσι μᾶλλον πιστεύειν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἢ τούτοις τοῖς κομφοῖς, ὧν τὸ ψυχάριον δριμύ μὲν, ὑγιὲς δὲ οὐδὲν βλέπει. Strauss remarks upon this (p. 30): 'noch klingen uns die Ohren von der gleichen Lection, die wir so oft von Christlichen Romantiken haben anhören müssen!'

⁴ Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII. 12. He was so extravagant in his hecatombs 'ut æstimaretur, si revertisset a Parthis, boves jam defuturos' (Amm. Marcell. XXV. 4).

Platonists and Neo-Pythagoreans.¹ If we add to this subjection of his reason to his imagination, this realistic deisidæmony, the fact that Julian displayed on all occasions inordinate literary vanity,² that he had an irresistible *cacoethes scribendi*, and was never tired of hearing himself talk,³ we shall have the materials necessary for an adequate explanation of all that is phenomenal in his character and conduct, and we shall see before us a weak but clever man, to whom his birth and subsequent circumstances had given an unusual opportunity of exhibiting his peculiarities. It is perhaps well for his already qualified reputation that his career was cut short at so early a period: for though he did not positively persecute the Christians,⁴ and treated some of them, such as Prohæresius, with marked consideration and indulgence,⁵ he had resolved to encourage in all ways those who adopted the pagan creed;⁶ he excluded the Christians from all educational influence;⁷ and it is not impossible that he might, if he had lived, have induced such a reaction in the Eastern Empire as would have rendered less likely the event on which the civilization of Europe has mainly turned—the conversion of the Goths to Christianity before they became a dominant power in the West, and were called upon to assist the Roman Christians in driving back Attila from the plains of Châlons.

The literary merits of Julian are not inconsiderable. His style and diction exhibit the best qualities observable in the language of Themistius and Libanius.⁸ He not only took these

¹ Liban. *Orat. parent.* § 83; *De ulcisc. Jul. nece*, § 22; Eunap. *Vit. Iamblichi*, p. 15 sq. Boissonade.

² Ammianus Marcell. XXII. 7, XXV. 4.

³ *Id.* XXV. 4: 'linguæ fusioris et admodum raro silentis.'

⁴ His principles were opposed to persecution; he says (*Epist.* LII. p. 438 B): λόγῳ δὲ πείθεσθαι χρή καὶ διδάσκεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οὐ πλῆγαις, οὐδὲ ὕβρεσιν, οὐδ' αἰκισμῷ τοῦ σώματος. Cf. *Epist.* VII. p. 376 C.

⁵ Hieron. *in Chron. An.* 2378.

⁶ Julian, *Epist.* VII. p. 376 C: ἐγὼ νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς οὔτε κτείνεσθαι τοὺς Γαλιλαίους οὔτε τύπτεσθαι παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον, οὔτε ἄλλο τι πάσχειν κακὸν βούλομαι, προτιμᾶσθαι μέντοι τοὺς θεοσεβεῖς καὶ πάνυ φημι δεῖν—ἀνδρας τε καὶ πόλεις. Cf. Lib. *Orat. parent.* § 59.

⁷ Ammian. Marcell. XX. 10, XXV. 4.

⁸ Wyttenbach, who undertook in one of his earlier labours to point out the manner in which Julian had imitated the ancients, and to vindicate the purity of his style, says in a later essay on the subject, that even his speech about Constantius is worthy of high praise (*Biblioth. Crit.* 1808, III. p. 34): 'in dictione et

great sophists as his model, but, like them, he diligently imitated the best of the classical writers, with whom he seems to have become familiar by long study. Particular phrases, more or less striking, are borrowed directly from Thucydides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and other masters of Attic Greek;¹ and it might be a good exercise for some young scholar to take a speech of Julian's and indicate the sources of his style. But besides what he has derived from careful study, a well-stored memory, and intentional imitation, Julian exhibits in his writings a decided talent for oratory, a warm and vigorous energy of conception, and a flow of lively humour, which belong to the genius of the man, and are not found in the best of his contemporaries. If his elevation to the throne spoiled a good professor of rhetoric and philosophy, it must be recollected that he owed much that distinguished him from the other sophists to the higher aspirations connected with his exalted rank.

§ 7. About half a century after the death of Julian, Constantinople gave birth to a Neo-Platonic enthusiast whom that emperor would have admired more than Iamblichus, and whom a modern philosopher has regarded as a combination of all that is excellent in Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, and the other master-minds of Greece;² but whom we must dismiss with a comparatively brief notice, as a bad commentator on his predecessors and a quacksalver of the theurgic school.

PROCLUS, or more properly *Proculus*,³ was born at Byzantium on the 8th February, A.D. 412,⁴ and was the son of a jurist named Patricius; Marcella was the name of his mother; so that he appears to have been of Italian lineage, though his

stylo nondum quidem ea est maturitas ac firmitas, quæ in posterioribus ejus scriptis; nulla tamen curiositas, nulli calamistri, nullæ ineptiæ, contra sanitas ac simplicitas, nec ea sine nervis ac luminibus.'

¹ See, for example, the instances noted by Wyttenbach, u.s. pp. 40, 46, 47, 48, 68.

² V. Cousin, *Procli Opera, Præfatio Generalis*, pp. XXVI., XXVII. Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 116: 'according to M. Cousin, as I am credibly informed, he is the Greek philosopher, the flower and crown of all the schools, 'in whom,' says the learned Frenchman, 'are combined, and from whom shine forth, in no irregular or uncertain rays, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus.'

³ Gronovius, *Observ.* IV. 21, 764; Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 115, note b.

⁴ Fabricius, *Prolegomena*, p. XXIV., ed. Boissonade.

family were settled at Xanthus in Lycia, whither he was taken while still a child.¹ At an early age he went to Alexandria, where he studied under Orion and Leonas.² After a visit to his native place in company with the latter he returned to Alexandria, and studied mathematics with great success under Heron, and the Peripatetic philosophy under Olympiodorus.³ When he was twenty years old he proceeded to Athens, where the Platonists Plutarchus, the son of Nestorius, and Syrianus of Gaza,⁴ imbued him with that ardent love of the Neo-Platonic doctrines which distinguished him through life, and gained him the title of *διάδοχος* or 'successor,' i.e. of Plutarchus and the Neo-Platonists.⁵ The first fruit of these studies was his commentary on the *Timæus*, which he wrote at the age of twenty-eight,⁶ and which he always considered as his best work.⁷ From this time he devoted himself to teaching, one might almost say preaching, the doctrines of the new Platonists, exhibiting in his conduct a pattern of the ascetic self-denial and moral purity which belonged to a hierophant of the school, and claiming as a natural result of his triumph over the flesh a direct communion with the world of spirits, and all the usual attributes of theurgic power.⁸ He treated with religious reverence the festivals of all heathen nations,⁹ and was the author of a psalm-book for the worship of Greek and other gods.¹⁰ But he stood in direct opposition to the Christians, whose mysterious doctrines he met with a Triad of his own;¹¹ and he seems

¹ Marinus, *Vita Procli*, c. 6, p. 6, Boiss.

² *Id. ibid.* c. 8. He was a sort of parlour-boarder in the house of Leonas : Λεώνας οὐ μόνον αὐτῷ λόγων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκονώνησεν ἀλλὰ καὶ σύνοικον ἔχειν ἡξίου καὶ συνδιατᾶσθαι γυναῖκι καὶ τέκνους παρεσκεύασεν.

³ *Ibid.* c. 9.

⁴ Syrianus introduced him to Plutarchus, *ibid.* c. 12, p. 10.

⁵ Fabricius says (ap. Boiss. p. 87): 'Proclus κατ' ἐξοχὴν dictus διάδοχος, nempe Platonicius, ut ex Ammonio notavit v.d. Heinsius, p. 79, ad Hesiodum.' See also Cousin, *Præfatio Generalis*, p. XXI.

⁶ Marinus, c. 13, p. 11.

⁷ *Ibid.* c. 38, p. 30 : περὶ δὲ τῶν συγγραμμάτων τοσούτον ἐρῶ, ὅτι αἰ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων πάντων προετίθει τὰ εἰς Τίμαιον ὑπομνήματα. ἡρέσκετο δὲ πᾶν καὶ τοῖς εἰς Θεαίτητον.

⁸ *Ibid.* cc. 22, 28.

⁹ *Ibid.* c. 19.

¹⁰ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* IX. pp. 405—407.

¹¹ On the three triads of Proclus, see Steinhart's article in Pauly, vol. IV., pp. 70, 71. Proclus says of them himself (*Theol. Plat.* III. 14): αἱ τρεῖς αὐται

to have had a special abhorrence for the doctrine of an evil principle and evil spirits,¹ which the Jews and Christians had borrowed from the dualism of the East. It is supposed that the adversaries, whom his biographer Marinus calls *γυπογίγαντες*,² and who compelled Proclus to leave Athens and take refuge for a year in Asia, were the Christians whom he had provoked by his antagonism. He conceived it his duty to maintain the old faith of heathendom, in the face of the established religion, by a diligent and most eclectic observance of positive rites, and he considered the philosopher as the high priest of all that was essentially true in the old polytheism of the world.³ He was eminently qualified for the position which he assumed. To a handsome person, great bodily strength, and unvarying health, he added wonderful powers of memory, and unrivalled attainments in many branches of knowledge. His voluntary abstinence and conspicuous devotion to his religious duties gave him the reputation of a saint, and an ignorant age accepted the statement of his admirers that he was endowed with miraculous powers. At length his constitution gave way under his long fasts and his other acts of penance.⁴ He died on the 17th April, 485,⁵ and the soul of the Pythagorean Nicomachus, which, according to the revelation of a dream, dwelt in him, as one of the Hermetic chain,⁶ had to seek some other tenement of clay.

τριάδες μυστικῶς ἐπαγγέλλουσι τὴν τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ καὶ ἀμεθέκτου παντελῶς ἀγνωστον αἰτίαν.

¹ Procl. *Theolog. Platon.* I. c. 17. The cause of evil is not without us, but consists in ἡ τῶν δεχομένων τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀσθένεια.

² *Vita Procli*, c. 15, p. 12: καὶ ποτε ἐν περιστάσει τινῶν γυπογιγάντων ἐξετασθεὶς, ἀπήρην ὡς εἶχε τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. In *Theol. Plat.* as quoted in the last note, he speaks of the belief that there is a malific soul as 'a barbaric folly and gigantic mythology' (δραματούργια γιγαντική).

³ *Ibid.* c. 19, p. 16: καὶ γὰρ πρόχειρον ἐκείνο εἶχεν αἰεὶ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὁ θεοσεβέστατος ἀνὴρ, ὅτι τὸν φιλόσοφον προσήκει οὐ μίᾳς τινὸς πόλεως οὐδὲ τῶν παρ' ἐνίοις πατρίων εἶναι θεραπευτὴν, κοινῇ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου κόσμου ἱεροφάντην.

⁴ It was during the last five years of his life that his constitution began to give way, Marin. c. 26, p. 21: ὑπὸ γὰρ τῆς σκληροτέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἀνυπόιστου διαίτης κ.τ.λ. καταπονηθὲν τὸ εὖ πεφυκὸς αὐτῷ σῶμα ἤρξατο παρῆσθαι μετὰ τὸ ἐβδομηκοστὸν ἔτος.

⁵ *Ibid.* c. 36, p. 28.

⁶ Marin. c. 28, p. 23: ὅτι τῆς Ἑρμαϊκῆς εἴῃ σειρᾶς σαφῶς ἐθεάσατο καὶ ὅτι τὴν Νικομάχου τοῦ Πυθαγορείου ψυχὴν ἔχοι ὅναρ ποτὲ ἐπίστευσεν.

The philosophical system of Proclus is, for the most part, merely an extension of that of Plotinus, with certain modifications borrowed from other sources. His works are commentaries on Plato,¹ treatises on Mathematics² and Astronomy,³ arguments against the Christians, preserved in an answer to them by John Philoponus,⁴ a treatise on theology,⁵ and some remains of his 'grammatical chrestomathy,' a collection of notices respecting the Greek poets, which is our chief authority respecting the epic cycle, but which some critics refer to another and earlier author.⁶ Besides these works which have come down to us, we have the titles of nearly twenty others which are entirely lost.⁷ The style of Proclus is, considering the late period at which he wrote, very pure, simple, unaffected, and in general accordance with his classical models.

Neither the reputation which Proclus enjoyed in his lifetime, nor the comprehensive and catholic spirit of his superstition, gave him any lasting influence in the world. Neo-Platonism was taught at Alexandria while Proclus was lecturing at Athens by HIEROCLES, who is known to us by a commentary on the golden verses of Pythagoras, and by a treatise on Providence, and whose essay on the worship of the gods has furnished a few extracts to Stobæus.⁸ HERMIAS too enjoyed some reputation,

¹ Besides the commentary on the *Timæus*, and those on the *Parmenides*, *Alcibiades*, &c., published by Cousin, we have a valuable work in six books, called *εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος θεολογίαν*. It has been translated into English by Taylor.

² His commentaries on Euclid contain most valuable information respecting the early Greek mathematicians.

³ Such are his *ὑποτύπωσις τῶν ἀστρονομικῶν ὑποθέσεων*, his treatise on the heavenly orbits (*σφαῖρα*), and his paraphrase of Ptolemy's *Tetrabiblon*.

⁴ *Ἐπιχειρήματα ἡ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*. See Suidas, s.v.

⁵ *Στοιχείωσις θεολογική, κεφάλαια σιά*. It is curious that this work was first translated into Latin by Patricius, a namesake of the father of Proclus (Ferrar. 1583).

⁶ Phot. *Cod.* CCXXXIX. The fragments are published in Gaisford's *Hephæstion*, vol. I. pp. 335 sqq., ed. alt.

⁷ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* IX. pp. 426 sqq.

⁸ As there were several persons of the name of Hierocles, the works attributed to the Neo-Platonist have been claimed for others known by the same designation. The *ἀστέια*, a sort of collection of Irish bulls, has been ascribed to an Alexandrian, and with the example of Bacon before us, we can hardly deny the possibility of a philosopher's fancy for such ludicrous stories.

as a pupil of Syrianus, and an Athenian Neo-Platonist;¹ but he is better known as the father of two pupils of Proclus, AMMONIUS² and HELIODORUS,³ who distinguished themselves at the beginning of the sixth century as commentators on Aristotle. The notes of Ammonius on the *introduction of Porphyry*, on the *categories*, and on the *interpretation*, may still be read with advantage. He also wrote a life of Aristotle. Proclus was represented more nearly in his own doctrines by his pupils MARINUS of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine,⁴ to whom we are indebted for a life of his master, and by ISIDORUS of Gaza⁵ and ZENODOTUS.⁶ These were followed by DAMASCIUS,⁷ originally a pupil of Ammonius, and afterwards of Marinus and the other two Athenian disciples of Proclus. SIMPLICIUS,⁸ a pupil of Damascius, fell back on the philosophy of Aristotle, and he is still known as the author of some of the best commentaries on that philosopher and on Epictetus. OLYMPIODORUS, another pupil of Damascius, was an acute and sensible commentator on Plato, though he is in many instances merely a copyist of his master Damascius. From a passage in his scholia on *the former Alcibiades*, it has been inferred that he taught in the early part of the sixth century,⁹ when the civil power had arrayed itself against the old schools of thought. For the days of heathen philosophy were numbered. In A.D. 529 Justinian closed the schools of Athens¹⁰ and prohibited the teaching of philosophy. Isidorus, Damascius, Simplicius, and some three or four others sought a refuge in Persia, hoping in a foreign land to obtain the toleration which had been denied to them at home. But the country of Xerxes was not more propitious to tranquil speculation than that of Themistocles. They had hardly arrived at the court of Chosroes, than they

¹ Phot. *Cod.* CLXXXI. CCXLII.; Suidas, s. v. Αἰδεσία; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* III. pp. 142, 176, 495. ² Fabricius, V. p. 707. ³ *Id.* VIII. p. 126.

⁴ Suidas, s. v.; Fabricius, IX. p. 370.

⁵ See Photius, *Cod.* XXIV. p. 568. He is called an Alexandrian by Suidas, s. v. Συριακός.

⁶ Photius, *Cod.* CLXXX., CCXLII.

⁷ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* III. pp. 79, 83, 230.

⁸ See the excellent article by Brandis in Smith's *Dictionary*, III. p. 837.

⁹ See Creuzer, in his edition of these scholia. Frankf. 1821.

¹⁰ Johann. Mal. XVIII. 187, ed. Mill.

found it utterly uncongenial with their tastes and habits, and they rejoiced when the peace between the Persians and the Roman Empire in A.D. 553 provided for their return to Greece, and for their freedom from molestation in the enjoyment of their religious beliefs and their philosophical studies.¹ When the last of them died, the heathen philosophy of Greece had ceased to exist.

¹ Agathias, II. 30, who is followed by Suidas, s.v. *πρέσβεις*.

CHAPTER LVIII.

ANTAGONISM OF CHRISTIANITY.—OPPONENTS OF HEATHEN LITERATURE.

§ 1. Gradual development of the antagonism between classical and Christian literature, and causes of the growing alienation. § 2. Classical tendencies of the earliest Christians. Justin Martyr. § 3. Clement of Alexandria. Hippolytus and Origen. § 4. The antagonism becomes pronounced, when Christianity is adopted as the state religion. Eusebius of Cæsarea. § 5. Christian Sophists. Prohæresius. § 6. Gregory of Nazianzus and his brother Cæsarius. § 7. Basil and his brother. Gregory of Nyssa. § 8. John Chrysostom. § 9. Nemeseus of Emesa and Synesius of Cyrene. § 10. Cyril of Alexandria.

§ 1. **I**N order to understand the nature of the antagonism between Christian and heathen learning in the fourth century, when the new faith had become the state religion of Constantinople, it is necessary to go back to the earliest ages of the Church; and we have reserved until now our examination of the Christian contributions to Greek literature, in order that we might undertake a connected and therefore a more instructive review of those whom modern romanticism has honoured with the title of Fathers of the Church. We shall thus see that the opposition between the literary spirit of old heathen Greece, and the Christian scholarship of the time of Constantine and his immediate successors, grew up very gradually; that the cause of the alienation is not to be sought either in Christianity itself, or in classicalism itself, but rather in the Oriental superstitions which distorted Christianity and disfigured Greek philosophy; in the dogmatical and heretical struggles which stimulated the controversial and intolerant spirit of Christian teachers; and, above all, in the gradual attribution, to certain writings of the earliest Christians, of a distinctive and exclusive character, which necessarily tended to nullify the pretensions and to qualify the value of all works of merely human genius. If this gradual development was at any time marked

by an abrupt transition, it was, of course, when the Christian Church from being a persecuted sect became a dominant religion in the time of Constantine, and had leisure to erect the lists for a grand tournament within its own walls. But although this important change brought the tendency to its crisis, the previous progress had been so complete that there was only a step to take, and for some years after that event the rupture between the heathen and Christian sophists was not very strongly pronounced. Julian's abortive attempt to create a reaction in favour of heathenism was the cause of the open antagonism between the classical and Christian forms of literature; and the Church was soon enabled not only to dictate its own rules of literary criticism, but to destroy the writings of its most formidable antagonists, and, as we have seen, to prohibit the teaching of heathen philosophy. About the same time the last rays of heathen cultivation in Italy were extinguished in the gloomy dungeon of Boethius. And the period so justly designated as 'the dark ages' commenced both in the Eastern and Western Empires. The ignorance which characterized these mediæval centuries was occasioned not only by the fact that a sacerdotal caste monopolized all available knowledge, but also by the collateral circumstance that the priestly education, such as it was, depended rather on narrow Semitic traditions than on the wider and more comprehensive training which was the heritage of the Indo-Germanic race. This subjugation of the nobler to the baser type of intellectual development¹ dated from the period when Eusebius wrote his normal work to prove that Greek philosophy had borrowed its most important and characteristic features from the Masoretical writings of the Jews. And this transplanted Israelitism has taken such deep root in Europe, that, although John and Paul were content to preach, in combination with their revealed truths, the Platonism which they had learned either from the original sources or through the muddy channels of Philo's learning, though Justin and Clement recognized an evangelical preparation in Greek philosophy no less than in Jewish theosophy, and though even

¹ Renan, *Histoire des langues Sémitiques*, I. p. 4: 'la race Sémitique, comparée à la race Indo-Européenne, représente réellement une combinaison inférieure de la nature humaine.'

Augustine declared that Socrates was the philosopher of the Catholic Faith, modern fanatics are permitted to insult with the name of Neo-Platonist those cultivated theologians, who in our days teach the pure doctrines of a spiritual religion, and refuse to bear the yoke of a Semitic and Pharisaic sacerdotalism, which was formally discarded when the good tidings of salvation were proclaimed to the universal family of mankind.

§ 2. If we go back to the beginnings of the Christian Church, we can discern no traces of a repugnance to the classical literature of the age. The Apostle Paul, though he admits¹ that the fundamental principles of the religion which he professed were to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, did not, on this account, shrink from the rabbinical or classical learning in which he had been trained from his earliest years. He not only quotes the Greek poets directly,² but shows tacitly that his mind was penetrated by the results of a long familiarity with them.³ St. John, though his early advantages were not equal to those of the scholar of Tarsus and the pupil of Gamaliel, acquired in his later years, that is, in the period of his literary activity, no inconsiderable acquaintance with the writings of his age. And both he and St. Paul had studied Philo. A similar cultivation must be conceded to Apollos, or Apollonius, whether he was or was not the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, *i. e.*, to the Hellenizing Jews of Alexandria.⁴ Even St. James, who was settled at Jerusalem, shows that he had mastered the refinements of classical Greek, which implies that he had read some good authors.⁵ Without these accomplishments, we can hardly conceive that the first ministers and missionaries of the new religion could have been qualified to speak in the Areopagus, or to address manifestoes, which were often polemical tracts, to the acute and

¹ 1 Cor. I. 23: ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἑλλήσι δὲ μωρίαν.

² 1 Cor. XV. 33, from the Thais of Menander, who probably borrowed the line from Euripides (cf. Socrates, *H. E.* III. 16); Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 350, Potter; *Tit.* I. 12, 13, from Epimenides; *Act. Apost.* XVII. 28, from Aratus.

³ See the remarkable references to the θεομαχία of Pentheus, to which we have elsewhere directed attention (*Chr. Orth.* pp. 291 sqq.).

⁴ See Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, I. pp. 33, 34.

⁵ As in the hexameter line apparently quoted in I. 17, with its juxtaposition of δόσις and δώρημα.

highly-educated inhabitants of the chief cities in Greece and Asia Minor; and the diffusion of revealed truth would have been checked by the deficiencies of its interpreters. This wise appropriation of all that was most graceful and humanizing in the philosophy and literature of pagan Greece, was equally conspicuous in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. We need only point to the case of JUSTINUS of Flavia Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, who was known in his lifetime as 'the philosopher,'¹ and bore after his death the title of 'martyr,' by which he is distinguished to the present day. Justin, who was born towards the end of the first century, probably about A.D. 89,² before St. John had written his gospel, was trained successively in the schools of the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists, and, after his conversion to Christianity, retained the garb and the outward profession of a philosopher.³ His apologies for his adopted religion, and his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, show that he was quite able to use with effect the weapons of Greek dialectics. 'Justin,' says a distinguished author of our day,⁴ 'is one of the most eminent Christian philosophers, a decidedly speculative thinker, and a good Hellenistic writer.' He was, perhaps, the earliest example of that wider view of God's dealings with his reasonable creatures, which assumes the possibility of a revelation, not only anterior to Christianity, but independent of Judaism. He held⁵ that the Word spoke through Socrates, when he refuted idol-worship, and that he and Heraclitus were virtually Christians, no less than Abraham and Elijah.⁶ It is impossible to overrate the importance of such a concession, as a means of reconciling heathen philosophy and Christian faith. It paves the way for the doctrine maintained by many modern

¹ Epiphanius, *adv. Hæres.* XLVI. 1; Eusebius, *Chron.* II.; *H. E.* IV. 8: 'Ἰουστίνος γνήσιος τῆς ἀληθοῦς φιλοσοφίας ἐραστής.

² This is the inference of Dodwell, Grabe, and others, from a doubtful passage in Epiphanius (u.s.). Others place his birth from fifteen to twenty-nine years later.

³ Neander says (*Church History*, II. p. 413, Eng. Tr.): 'He may be regarded as an itinerant missionary in the garb of a philosopher.'

⁴ Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. I. p. 216.

⁵ *Apol.* c. 5.

⁶ *Apol.* I. § 46, pp. 34, 20, 90, 91, apud Potter, *ad Clem. Strom.* I. p. 349.

divines,¹ that grace is attainable by all good men, and tends to remove the barrier between 'the Limbo of the Fathers,' and 'the bosom of Abraham.'

§ 3. Justin seems to have suffered martyrdom in the reign of M. Aurelius;² and not long after he had sealed his confession with his blood, the union of philosophy and Christianity was maintained on the broadest basis by Pantænus and his pupil Clement of Alexandria. Of the former we know very little. He was probably a Sicilian, who settled in Alexandria as a teacher of divinity, after missionary labours in the south of Arabia. Originally he had been a Stoic, but, like Justin, he inclined to Platonism. His disciple, T. FLAVIUS CLEMENS, generally called CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, from his long residence in that city, has left us a collection of works, which, for learning and literary talent, stands unrivalled among the writings of the early Christian fathers. It is generally supposed that he was a native of Athens. His name suggests an hereditary connexion with Rome. It is the same as that of the cousin of Domitian, who is supposed to have been a Christian, and was put to death at the end of the first century,³ and it is possible that Clemens may have been descended from a freedman of that eminent Roman. After studies pursued in Greece, Italy, Palestine, Syria, and Egypt,⁴ he settled at Alexandria, was either converted to Christianity, or confirmed in his belief by Pantænus,⁵ became a presbyter of the Church, and about A.D. 190, was associated with his master as a catechetical teacher

¹ See Gloucester Ridley's *Sermons on the divinity and operations of the Holy Ghost*, Oxford, 1802, pp. 199—242.

² Semisch places the death of Justin in A.D. 166: see his essay, *über das Todesjahr Justins des Märtyrers*, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1835, pp. 907 sqq. Mr. F. J. A. Hort, who agrees in many points with Volkmar (*Tüb. Theolog. Jahrbücher*, 1855, pp. 227—283, 412—468), sets down 'Justin's first *Apology* to 145, or better to 146, and his death to 148. The second *Apology*, if really separate from the first, will then fall in 146 or 147, and the *Dialogue with Trypho* about the same time' (*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, III. pp. 155—193).

³ Sueton. *Domit.* 15. Dion Cassius, LXVII. 14, says that his crime was atheism, which, of course, means Christianity.

⁴ *Strom.* I. p. 322, Potter.

⁵ Eusebius, *H. E.* V. 11, VI. 13: ἐν οἷς ὀνομαστὶ ὡς διδασκάλου τοῦ Πανταίνου μνημονεύει. Cf. Potter, *ad Clem. Strom.* I. p. 322, note 8.

of divinity. The persecutions of Septimius Severus probably obliged them both to take refuge in Palestine, about A.D. 202,¹ and he was at Jerusalem in the reign of Caracalla. It does not appear that he ever returned to Alexandria, and in A.D. 213 we find him recommended to the Christians of Antioch by Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem.²

Clemens was professedly a gnostic, in his own sense of the term, that is, a philosophical Christian, one who believed that the philosophical studies in which he had been trained were not only not inconsistent with the faith which he had adopted, but as good an access to that faith as the law of the Jews. 'Philosophy,' he says,³ 'before the coming of our Lord, was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness; now, however, it is useful for piety, being a sort of preparatory instruction (*προπαιδεία*) for those who derive faith by means of demonstration. For God is the cause of all good things; but of some in the way of premisses (*κατὰ προηγούμενον*), as the Old and New Testament; of others, in the way of a conclusion (*κατ' ἐπακολούθημα*), as philosophy. Perhaps, however, philosophy was given to the Greeks by way of premisses (*προηγούμενως*) before the Lord called the Greeks also. For philosophy also was a tutor (*ἐπαιδαγώγει*), who led the Greeks, as the law did the Jews, to Christ.' And he expresses the same idea with the necessary cautions in another passage: 'Although philosophy by itself (*καθ' ἑαυτήν*) formerly justified (*ἐδικαίου*) the Greeks, it did not do this with regard to universal righteousness (*εἰς τὴν καθόλου δικαιοσύνην*), with regard to which it is found to be a fellow-worker, just as the first and second steps assist him who is mounting to an upper chamber, and as the grammarian assists the philosopher. Clearness of exposition (*σαφηνεία*),' he adds, 'contributes to the transmission of truth; and logic (*διαλεκτική*) prevents us from yielding to the inroads of heresy. The doctrine of our Saviour is perfect in itself, and needs no additions,

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* VI. 3.

² *Id.* VI. 11, p. 175, Heinichen.

³ *Strom.* I. p. 331, Potter. The allusion at the end is of course to the well-known passage, *Gal.* III. 24. Mr. Keble says in his *Prælectiones Academicæ*, pp. 809, 810: 'perplacet eorum ratio, quibus videntur Græcæ Latinaeque litteræ simili ferme fungi officio, quod ad illas gentes attinet, atque oracula prophetarum, quod ad Hebræos.'

⁴ *Ibid.* I. p. 377, Potter.

being the power of God and the wisdom of God. Now Greek philosophy joining its banner does not make the truth more powerful; but, by depriving of all power the sophistical attacks upon it, and by warding off the deceitful machinations against the truth, it has been called the proper wall and rampart of the vineyard.' The philosophy, for which he claims such high functions and attributes, was not that of any particular sect or school.¹ 'By philosophy,' he says,² 'I do not mean the Stoic, the Platonic, the Epicurean, or the Aristotelian; but all that has been well said in each of those sects, teaching righteousness with religious science—all this selected truth (τοῦτο σύμπαν τὸ ἐκλεκτικόν) I call philosophy. But I should never predicate a divine origin of all those dogmas which they have taken for themselves from the base metal of human speculations, and put into currency with an unauthorized stamp.' This distinction between the eternal and universal science, which is found in all systems, and the fleeting clouds of opinion by which it is obscured from time to time, is always present to his mind, and he has given expression to his feelings in a sentence which ought to be the golden rule of all theologians:³ 'As it seems, we incline more to mere matters of opinion (τὰ ἔνδοξα), even when they are contradictory, than to the truth; for she is austere and solemn. And verily, as there are three conditions of the soul—ignorance (ἀγνοία), opinion (οἵησις), science (ἐπιστήμη)—those who live in ignorance are the heathen, those

¹ Notwithstanding this eclecticism, Clement attaches particular importance to Plato, and recognizes a special relationship between his teaching and the revealed religion of the Jews. He calls him (*Strom.* I. p. 321, Potter): ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος Πλάτων, and says, *Pædagog.* I. 1: ὁ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξηλωκὼς τῶν φιλοσόφων Πλάτων τὸ ἔναυσμα τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς φιλοσοφίας ζωπυρῶν. So that he seems, as far as Plato was concerned, to have had a tendency to the view which Eusebius afterwards promulgated in so uncompromising a manner—that the Greeks really derived their philosophical truths from the same divine sources as the Jews. He does not, however, suggest that any heathen except Plato got his information directly from the Jews; to the philosophers in general the truth was imparted, like the Promethean fire, by some apostate spirit who had stolen it from heaven (*Strom.* I. pp. 366, 369). See Cæsar Morgan, *on the Trinity of Plato and Philo-Judæus*, p. 97, ed. Holden.

² *Strom.* I. p. 338, Potter. The last words of the passage we have been obliged to paraphrase. They are: ὅσα δὲ ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν ἀποτεμνόμενοι παρεχάραξαν ταῦτα οὐκ ἂν ποτε θεῖα εἴποιμ' ἂν.

³ *Strom.* VII. p. 894, Potter.

who are guided by opinion are the heretics, and those who have attained to science constitute the true church.' The test of truth and the means of reconciliation he finds in that which the systems of philosophy have in common with themselves and with Christianity; and similarly the criterion of religious or revealed truth is 'the conformity of the Old and New Testaments,'¹ 'the concord and harmony of the law and the prophets with the covenant delivered at the time of our Lord's appearance.'²

It was in accordance with these comprehensive views of the divine harmony and universal identity of truth, wherever it is found, that Clemens wrote a systematic and connected series of elaborate works, remarkable no less as contributions to the learned literature of Greece, than as apologetic treatises of the highest interest and value. 'The mind of Clemens,' says one of the ablest of his modern admirers,³ 'was bent on the union of science and faith, of thought and of life, of speculation and of historical revelation. This great object of his life led to his becoming the first Christian philosopher of the history of mankind. He believed in a universal plan of a Divine education of the human race, and tried to demonstrate it both speculatively and historically. The very nature of such a problem raised him above the views of Plato and Aristotle with regard to the human race. He developed his ideas systematically, in a course of spirited and profound works, addressed successively to the inquiring but unbelieving Gentile (in the *Προτρεπτικός λόγος*, or 'exhortation'), to the aspiring catechumen (in the *Παιδαγωγός*, or 'tutor'), to the tried and advancing Christian (in the *Στρωματεῖς*, or 'parti-coloured carpets'),⁴ and finally to the

¹ *Ibid.* p. 894: εἰ δὲ καὶ μαχόμενα δόγματα ἐφέλκεσθαι τινὰς δοκεῖ ὑπεξαίρετόν ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς εἰρηνοποιοὺς τῶν δογμάτων πορευτέον, οἱ κατεπαδουσι ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς τοὺς ψοφοδεεῖς τῶν ἀπέλων τὴν ἀλήθειαν διὰ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τῶν διαθηκῶν σαφηνίζοντες.

² *Ibid.* VI. p. 803: κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ συνῶδια καὶ ἡ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίαν διδομένη διαθήκη.

³ Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, I. p. 237. Cf. the remarks of Neander, *Ch. Hist.* II. p. 455, Engl. Tr.

⁴ This book is generally cited as *Stromata*. That the true name is *Στρωματεῖς*, from *στρωματεύς*, is sufficiently declared by Clemens himself, who says at the end of his first book: ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομνημάτων

well-prepared theological student (in the 'Υποτυπώσεις, or 'sketches').

In the earlier ages of the Church, Clemens was regarded as a champion of the faith, no less distinguished by his sincere piety than by his learning and abilities; and it would have been well for Christianity if the principles, which he set forth with such an array of profound scholarship and ingenious reasoning, had been adopted more generally by those that came after him. If the Christian religion had been always presented to the world in the calm, moderate, and conciliatory spirit which characterizes the writings of Clement of Alexandria, we should have had much less of dogmatism and intolerance, of heresy and schism, of sham belief and indignant infidelity. But evil days followed hard afoot, stereotyped dogmatism took the place of true religion, as soon as Christianity became a dominant creed; and at the present day, if any one, even in a Protestant community, were to assert the liberal and comprehensive principles of the great Father of Alexandria, he would be told that he wished to compromise the distinctive claims of revelation, and that he was little better than a heathen and a publican.

Among those who are said to have had the advantage of receiving instruction from Clement of Alexandria, no one has revived to a greater reputation in these latter days than HIPPOLYTUS, the bishop of Portus, or the port of Rome at the mouth of the Tiber, whose lately-discovered book 'on the

πρῶτος ἡμῖν Στρωματεὺς ἐνταῦθα περιγεγράφθω. And the author has also told us in what sense he used the name (*Strom.* IV. p. 565, Potter): ἔστω δὲ ὑμῖν τὰ Υπομνήματα ὡς πολλάκις εἴπομεν, διὰ τοὺς ἀναίδην [1. ἀνέδην] ἀπείρως ἐντυγχάνοντας ποικίλα, ὡς αὐτόπουτοῦνομά φησι, διεστρώμενα ἀπ' ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο συνεχὲς μετιόντα. It seems that strictly the word *στρωματεὺς* was a synonym for *στρωματοδεσμός*, the bag in which the bedding was carried; but either this was made of patchwork, like the coverlet itself, or *στρωματεῖς* was used by later writers as a synonym for *στρώματα*. That the patchwork or parti-coloured appearance was the conspicuous feature is clear from the fact that *στρωματεὺς* also denoted a fish with golden stripes or bands over his body (*Athen.* VII. p. 322 A). But Clement compares his work also to a field full of all kinds of produce, ὥσπερ τὸ παμβότανον τοῦ ἀγροῦ (*Job* V. 25), or to the mixed offering described in the fragments of Sophocles and Timocles, which he quotes (pp. 565, 566); and he adds: χρὴ τοίνυν πολλάκις, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς πλοχάνοις, διασείοντας καὶ ἀναβρίπτουντας τὴν πολυμυγίαν σπερμάτων, τὸν πυρὸν ἐκλέγειν. So that the title really means nearly the same as the *Κεστοί* of Julius Africanus, or the *ποικίλη ἱστορία* of Ælian (above, chapter LVI. § 5), namely, 'miscellanies or varieties.'

refutation of all heresies' has given rise to a most instructive discussion, reaching to all the details of early Christian history.¹ Of this Hippolytus we know very little. A long list is given of his writings,² and he is stated by Photius to have been an intimate friend of Origen, and a great admirer of his works. It is supposed that he suffered martyrdom by drowning³ early in the reign of Maximus, about A.D. 235. All that can be said about him is stated in the exhaustive treatises of Bunsen and others. For our present purpose, it is sufficient to mention that, without evincing the comprehensive liberality of Clemens, he is not prevented by the subject of his book from expressing, in his treatise on the heresies, a very sober and moderate judgment respecting the conclusions of the Greek philosophers.⁴ 'He does not say that there was no truth in them; he contents himself with saying that their speculations on physical philosophy had not led to any satisfactory results.'⁵ His meaning is, that these systems prove the impossibility of founding theology and ethics on physical speculations, and that these speculations had led the Greeks to forget God, the Creator, in nature, his creatures. This is what he states explicitly in the remarkable conclusion of the first book.⁶

A more definite and conspicuous place in Christian literature is assignable to ORIGEN, who was at first supposed to be the author of the treatise on heresies which has given such renewed

¹ In the year 1851 Emmanuel Müller published at Oxford the contents of a MS. brought from Greece by Mynas Mynoides, under the title of 'Ὁριγένους φιλοσοφούμενα ἢ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἐλεγχος. That this work was the refutation of heresies attributed to Hippolytus by Photius (*Cod. CCII.*), was first, we believe, pointed out by Dr. John Barrow of Oxford, and this was elaborately established by Bunsen in his work on *Hippolytus and his Age*, which is now a part of his elaborate *Stromateis* entitled *Christianity and Mankind*. To this book, and the rival treatise by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, the reader is referred for a full discussion of all controverted points.

² 'The complete list of his writings,' says Neander (*Ch. Hist.* II. p. 440), 'is obtained by comparing the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, the notices of his works which are found on his statue, the account of Photius, and the catalogue of Ebedjesu, a Nestorian author of the thirteenth century.'

³ Either in the sea or in a well; see Mr. Benson's paper on *the Martyrdom and Commemorations of St. Hippolytus*, in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. I. for 1854, pp. 202 sqq.

⁴ Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, I. p. 397.

⁵ *Refutatio Hæresium*, X. 8, p. 314, ed. Oxon.

⁶ *Ref. Hæc.* p. 32.

importance to the name of his friend Hippolytus. Origen, who is generally distinguished from his heathen namesake by the epithet *Adamantius*, 'the man of steel,' given to him on account of his colossal strength and indefatigable industry,¹ was born at Alexandria A.D. 184. His father Leonides held a prominent position among the Christians of that city, and suffered martyrdom in A.D. 202, during the persecution of Septimius Severus. His ardent and enthusiastic son wished to share his fate, but was detained at home by his mother, who had hidden all his clothes, and so prevented him from leaving the house. But he sustained the constancy of his father by a letter, in which he urged him not to waver for the sake of his family. Thus left to his own guidance when he was not yet seventeen, Origen came forward as the guide and teacher of the dispirited believers at Alexandria. He had received instruction from Clement, probably also from Pantænus,² and under the guidance of Ammonius Saccas³ had already laid the foundations of that learning which made him the wonder of his age. He was at the same time carried away by an ardent imagination, which, while it gave a fresh glow to his eloquence, and increased his influence with all those who approached him, quite overpowered his judgment, and led him not only to speculative extravagances in his theology, but even induced him, in obedience, as he thought, to the letter of a text in one of the gospels,⁴ to inflict upon himself a mutilation which his riper judgment told him was as unjustifiable⁵ as it was irremediable. His dauntless courage was as conspicuous as his

¹ Neander says (*Ch. Hist.* II. p. 456, note, Eng. Tr.): 'in case this surname was given to him after his death, we must not follow the strained interpretation of Photius, *Cod.* CXVIII.,—because Origen's proofs resembled adamantine bonds,—but rather the interpretation of Jerome—from his iron diligence, as we commonly express it. Hence he was also called *συντάκτης* and *χαλκέντερος*. Yet Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 13, seems to cite this cognomen as one which Origen bore from the first.'

² Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 6. 14.

³ That Origen was taught by this Ammonius is clear from the words of Porphyry (*apud Euseb.* VI. 19): "Ἑλλην ἐν Ἑλλήσι παιδευθεὶς λόγοις πρὸς τὸ βάρβαρον ἐξώκειλε τόλμημα, and from Origen's own expression: παρὰ τῷ διδασκάλῳ τῶν φιλοσόφων μαθημάτων: see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* II. p. 464, note.

⁴ *Matthew* XIX. 12: καὶ εἰσιν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλεῖαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν, χωρεῖται.

⁵ Origen, *Comment. in Matth.* tom. XV. 1.

ascetic self-denial. When seized on one occasion and ordered to distribute palm-twigs at the Serapeion, he boldly said, as he gave these symbols to the worshippers, 'take this palm—not in the name of Serapis, but in the name of Jesus Christ.'¹ He became a catechetical teacher at the age of eighteen, and held this office till his visit to Rome, probably in A.D. 212, where he had an opportunity of hearing Hippolytus. After his return to Alexandria, he devoted himself to biblical and philosophical studies. As a hearer of Ammonius Saccas he had been initiated into the heathen eclecticism of the age, and there is no doubt that his philosophy tended towards Neo-Platonism, which was also favourable to his asceticism. A growing misunderstanding with Demetrius, the Bishop of Alexandria, led to his retirement from Alexandria to Palestine, where he had resided on a former occasion, and in his absence he was degraded from his office of catechist, and even excommunicated, on the ground that he had been ordained a presbyter at Cæsarea, although he was disqualified for the clerical office by the mutilation which he had inflicted on himself in his early youth, and still more because in his works on the grounds of the Christian religion he had been guilty of heretical statements at variance with the doctrines of the Church. This was in A.D. 231. And though Demetrius died soon afterwards and was succeeded by Heraclas, whom Origen had converted to Christianity, the sentence was not recalled, and Origen remained in exile till his death. His place of abode was Cæsarea, where he preached constantly in the church, and composed most of his commentaries. He also made several tours, especially to Greece and Arabia. After suffering torture and imprisonment in the persecution of Decius (A.D. 249—251), he was released on the death of that emperor, and died at Tyre towards the end of A.D. 253.²

The works of Origen, which were very numerous,³ consisted of

¹ Epiphanius, *Hær.* p. 64.

² Euseb. *H. E.* VII. 2; Phot. *Cod.* CXVIII.; Clinton, *F. R. I.* p. 275.

³ The most complete list of the works of Origen is that given by Jerome, in comparison with those of Varro, in a MS. of the twelfth century, preserved in the library at Arras, and printed by Ritschl under the title: *Schriftstellerei des M. Terentius Varro und die des Origenes. Nach dem ungedruckten Katalog des Hieronymus*, Bonn, 1847.

(a) elaborate commentaries on the Scriptures, (b) the first attempt at a critical edition and translation of the Old Testament, (c) a defence of Christianity against the misrepresentations of Celsus, which is still extant in eight books, (d) a treatise in four books on the grounds of the Christian religion ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$), which created a great sensation in his own and the immediately following age, but is now represented only by the inaccurate version of Rufinus and by fragments and extracts in the *Philocalia* and elsewhere,¹ (e) *Stromateis* or 'parti-coloured carpets' in ten books, written of course in imitation of his teacher Clemens; besides a great number of occasional pieces, epistles, and the like. The book called *Philocalia*, compiled by Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Cæsarea, is chiefly made up of extracts from the writings of Origen.²

The great object of Origen is to reconcile Christianity, as derived from the Old and New Testament, with the speculations of Neo-Platonism. His theory is given in the book 'on principles' ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$), and appeared somewhat heretical to the stereotyped formalists of the fourth century. The principles of interpretation, by means of which he harmonizes the letter of Scripture with the combinations of his philosophy, are much the same as those which Philo had adopted, and which Julian afterwards applied to the legends of Greek polytheism. The only difference is that Origen is somewhat more methodical, and finds the justification of his allegories in the language of Scripture itself. He recognizes in the written word the *trichotomy*, or threefold division, which St. Paul had indicated as incidental to the nature of man.³ He says that 'as man consists of body, soul, and spirit, so, too, does Holy Scripture, which has been granted by divine benevolence for the salvation

¹ There is an abstract of this work, as far as it remains, in Clinton's *F. R.* II. pp. 496—507.

² Neander, *Church History*, IV. p. 449, Engl. Tr.: 'Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzus published, as the result of their common studies, a chrestomathy from the writings of Origen (the $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$) with a view to the diffusion of his spiritual ideas, and particularly of his principles of interpretation.'

³ He argues from this trichotomy in his explanation of the principle within us which leads us to concupiscence, and seems to arrive at much the same results with those implied in Plato's allegory of the charioteer and his two steeds: see the account of his doctrine in Clinton, *F. R.* II. p. 501.

of man.' And thus the simple may be edified by the *body* (σῶμα), the more advanced by the *soul* (ψυχή), and the perfect by the *spirit* (πνεῦμα); or the *body* was for those who went before us, the *soul* is for us, and the *spirit* for those who shall receive the inheritance of eternal life. In accordance with this fanciful harmony between man and Scripture, Origen conceived a threefold sense in the Bible—the *carnal*, or purely historical; the *psychical*, or moral interpretation; and the *spiritual*, or speculative sense.¹ It is needless to observe that though there are allegories more or less concealed in all religious books of great antiquity, the general application of these principles paves the way for any amount of fanciful absurdity.² It is, in fact, only justifiable by the feeling that truth cannot be inconsistent with truth, and that if certain books are necessarily true, they must be accommodated to the results of philosophical reasoning, which the mind has already accepted as true in themselves. With all its absurdity, then, we must honour Origen's last attempt to reconcile philosophy with Christianity, as a dying effort of religious freedom; as the last example of that unrestrained application of the reason to matters of faith which had been exhibited by St. Paul and St. John, but which has been denied to all orthodox believers, from the days when councils first began to substitute the bed of Procrustes for 'the large room' in which the Gospel had set the feet of its professors. 'With Origen,' says his latest and most eloquent panegyrist,³ 'closes apostolical Christianity as to its liberty of mind amidst tyranny and bloody persecution; his efforts are the last attempt made to combine thought and tradition, and avert a confusion which he saw to be impending. Indeed, they are the last efforts of ancient Christianity to treat spiritual concerns and traditions as intellectual, and as belonging to the inalienable domain of

¹ See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* III. p. 497, Eng. Tr.; Bunsen, *Christ. and Mankind*, I. p. 294; Westcott, *Elements of Gospel Harmony*, pp. 206, 7.

² Dr. Cæsar Morgan, in his learned essay *on the Trinity of Plato and Philo-Judæus*, remarks (p. 140, ed. Holden): 'It is not easy to ascertain exactly the precise opinions of so fanciful an interpreter and so loose a reasoner as Origen. But this, I think, we may venture to affirm, that they were not so exceptionable as the principles and reasonings which he advanced in the defence and explanation of them.'

³ Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, I. pp. 285, 6.

reason, under the guidance of faith, and with the pledge of individual self-responsibility. Soon after this time a systematic persecution, an inflamed enthusiasm, and hierarchical pretension conspired to trouble the serenity of mind which such contemplations required. When these persecutions merged into favour, protection gave power and privilege, and engendered internal persecution. Christian divinity, as well as Christian society, was drawn into the vortex of Byzantine tyranny and corruption, and conventionalism and formalism seized and gradually benumbed the members of the visible body of Christ. Origen's death is the real end of free Christianity, and, in particular, of free intellectual theology.'

§ 4. When the Christian religion obtained the protection of the secular arm, two results followed as inevitable consequences. As the free speculation, which had previously been allowed and practised in the Church, had produced oppositions of opinion in regard to some obscure and mysterious doctrines, which were regarded as the fundamental principles of the faith,¹ it was quite in accordance with human nature, that the different parties should proclaim themselves respectively to be exclusively orthodox, and should endeavour to obtain from the civil authority an exclusive protection for themselves, and a decisive condemnation of their antagonists. And as freedom of speculation and the unrestrained use of the reason are, *ipso facto*, excluded, when the appeal is limited to the rigid construction of a document supposed to be infallible, and when, in addition to this, a particular interpretation is laid down as the only allowable meaning of that which is in itself obscure or ambiguous, it is clear that there can be no longer any alliance, nay, not even a truce, between philosophy and faith, but that the literature of the one must be formally divorced from the literature of the other.² Both these

¹ It seems pretty obvious that the discussion between Arius and Alexander, the latter of whom was subsequently represented by Athanasius, originated in the different senses given to the term *Λόγος* by Philo-Judæus; see Cæsar Morgan, u.s. pp. 144 sqq.

² The successive steps or stages in the relative positions of Christianity and heathen literature are the four following: (1) Clemens Alexandrinus recognized a common truth in all systems, Christianity included. (2) Ammonius Saccas maintained that every sect might be found to be possessed of all the most important truths, if their doctrines were properly examined. (3) Plotinus contended that revelation

results were speedily seen when Christianity became the creed of Constantine. On the one hand, the great controversy between the Athanasians and the Arians made the Church itself a battle-field, in which rulers protected or persecuted those who did not agree with them, just as heathen emperors had protected heathendom, and persecuted the Church as a body. And, on the other hand, Christian writers confined themselves more and more exclusively to their own literature, and employed the accomplishments, which they had gained in the schools of the heathen sophists, only to embellish their homilies, or to give greater pungency to their attacks on their heathen teachers or on one another.

It belongs to a history of the Church to discuss the details of the Arian controversy; we are only concerned with its bearings on the history of Greek literature. That both Arius and Athanasius were sincere in their opinions, and in the importance which they attached to them, that they were both good men,¹ and that the persecutions to which they were successively exposed were disgraceful to the Church and its governors, we are prepared to maintain, without relinquishing our opinion that the orthodox party was speculatively right. With the theological question we have no concern here. But the period of this controversy constitutes an epoch in the later development of Greek literature, because it saw the first beginning of ecclesiastical history, and the first formal announcement of the opinion that the Christians had nothing to learn from the old culture of the heathen world, which was but a borrowed and feeble glare derived from the divine light of revelation.

Among those who were summoned to the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325, there was no one who took a more prominent, and,

had taught nothing new concerning the nature of God and the moral duties of man, but that philosophy had delivered the same doctrines long before to the heathen world. (4) Eusebius and other Christians of the fourth century formally enounced the theory, which had been more timidly suggested by Justin Martyr and others, that the truths of pagan literature were really derived in some extraordinary manner from the divine illumination of the Jewish mind.

¹ Of the moral character of Arius, it is sufficient to say that it was never impugned by his bitterest enemies. He was, in fact, a rigid ascetic: see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* IV. 9. Athanasius has been warmly praised even by Gibbon, vol. III. p. 70, ed. W. Smith.

at the same time, moderate part than EUSEBIUS, bishop of Cæsarea, who is generally distinguished from his Arian colleague, Eusebius of Nicomedia, by the adjunct *Pamphili*, indicating his friendship for a bishop of that name. Seated at the right hand of the emperor, whom he had been deputed to address in a panegyrical speech, Eusebius acted as a sort of moderator during the debates of the council, and, with the proper feeling that a creed should be comprehensive rather than exclusive, he drew up and proposed to the meeting a conciliatory formula,¹ which Arius was willing to accept, but which Alexander, with Athanasius at his elbow, made exclusive by the insertion of the epithet *ὁμοούσιος*.² Baffled in this attempt to keep the peace of Christendom, Eusebius did not depart from the moderation of his views. He would have been glad to see Arius reinstated in his church, and gave no encouragement to the violence of the Athanasian party. It is also to be mentioned to his credit that he neither yielded to the growing image-worship of the age,³ nor relinquished the critical discrimination which still distinguished between the genuine, the doubtful, and the spurious books of what is now the Christian canon.⁴

Such a man was as well qualified as any bishop of the fourth century could possibly be to come forth as the historian of the Church, and we are indebted to him for a book, which is not only the earliest of its class, but is not superseded by any subsequent compilation. The *Ecclesiastical History* (ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία) of Eusebius is in ten books, and extends from the beginnings of Christianity to the year A.D. 324. He says nothing about the Arian controversy, although he lived to A.D. 340; and as the bishop Paulinus, who died in A.D. 329,⁵ is addressed at the commencement of the last book, it is concluded

¹ Socrates, *H. E.* I. 5.

² On the subsequent adoption of this term by Eusebius, see Gibbon, II. p. 64, note 80, ed. W. Smith.

³ *Vit. Constant.* III. p. 1069, *H. E.* VII. 18, with Heinichen's *Excursus*, X. pp. 396 sqq.

⁴ *H. E.* III. 25. His terms for the three classes are the *ὁμολογούμενα*, the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, and the *νόθα*.

⁵ See the note in Heinichen's edition, *H. E.* X. I. pp. 202—4: 'mortuus est igitur Paulinus anno 329 cum episcopatum Antiochiæ sex menses gessisset.' Some place his death five years earlier.

that the work was composed principally before the Council of Nicæa, and that he abstained from all additions to it. If so, it may be inferred that his wise moderation was the natural result of his careful survey of the development of Christianity before it received the dangerous patronage of Constantine.

Eusebius was not content, however, to make the Christian community appear in as favourable a light as possible by narrating the virtues of its earliest teachers, and suppressing all reference to the disgraceful discord of his own days.¹ He has also written an elaborate work, in which he places the antagonism between Christianity and heathenism in its most pronounced form, and distinctly repudiates any attempt, like those made by Clemens and Origen, to discover any independent goodness or truth in Greek philosophy, making it his object to show that heathen lore was generally false and foolish, and that when it attained or approximated to the truth, it was but a feeble echo of the distinct revelations of the Old Testament.² This was his 'Introduction to the Evangelical Demonstration' (ἐναγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως προπαρασκευή) in fifteen books, followed by the 'Evangelical Demonstration' in twenty books. The latter, of which only ten books are extant, is directed against

¹ Gibbon maintains (II. pp. 281 sqq.) that Eusebius is guilty of intentional dishonesty; his credit as an historian has been canvassed by others (see Milman's note, p. 281 and cf. above, p. 130), and it must be allowed that he adopted occasionally the dangerous doctrine of reserve in the communication of truth; at least, one of the chapters in his *Præparatio Evangelica* (XII. 31) is headed: *ὅτι δεήσει ποτε τῷ ψεύδει ἀντὶ φαρμάκου χρῆσθαι ἐπὶ ὠφελείᾳ τῶν δεομένων τοῦ τοιοῦτου τρόπου.*

² It is to be remarked, however, that even Clement himself gave some countenance to this view, as we have seen above; and his later contemporary, M. Minucius Felix, in his dialogue called *Octavius*, which appeared about A.D. 226 (Holden's *Introduction*, p. XXIV.) says (XXXIV. 4, p. 171, Holden): *'animadvertitis philosophos eadem disputare, quæ dicimus, non quod nos simus eorum vestigia subsequuti, sed quod illi de divinis prædicationibus prophetarum umbram interpolatæ veritatis imitati sint.'* But these views of the earlier Christians were very different from those of Eusebius; for while he maintains a direct connexion between heathen and Jewish literature, they contented themselves with more fanciful assumptions to account for the particles of divine light which they recognized in the writings of Greek philosophers and poets, and either held that the Divine Logos immediately inspired these pagan sages (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. § 46; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 349), or attributed their illumination to the furtive proceedings of some *δύναμις ἢ ἄγγελος μαθὼν τι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ μὴ καταμείνας ἐν αὐτῇ* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. p. 366).

the Jews, and its arguments are taken from the Old Testament. But the former, which abounds in profane learning, and which is still of great use to the historian of Greek philosophy, is avowedly written to discourage the study of that philosophy, and to show its uselessness to the Christian. It is therefore the epochal work in regard to the new attitude assumed by Christian literature; it is the declaration of a Christian, himself learned in profane lore, that from thenceforth the Church is as independent of heathen philosophy as it is fearless of the secular opposition of the heathen world. The nature of the treatise will appear from the following brief sketch of its contents. The *first* book treats of the Greek and other heathen cosmogonies, and gives us an important fragment of Sanchoniathon, or rather Philo of Byblus, respecting the Phœnician theories or traditions on that subject.¹ The *second* book deals with the religion of Egypt as derived from Manetho, and that of Greece, as described by Diodorus Siculus, Euhemerus, and Clement of Alexandria, and endeavours to show that Greek philosophers in general, and Plato in particular, are not better guides in religion than the mere popular belief of their times; it also rejects the allegorical interpretation of Greek mythology, appealing to the Roman polytheists to show that it is untenable. This latter subject is pursued in the *third* book, which shows that no advantage is got from rationalizing old mythology. A similar argument is developed in the *fourth* and *fifth* books, which also maintain the notion that the Greek deities were the dæmons expelled by our Saviour.² The *sixth* book discusses the doctrine of destiny, and denies the astrological theories of the heathens. In the *seventh* and *eighth* books, Eusebius discusses the Jewish system, and the origin of the Septuagint translation. The next five books (IX.—XIII.) are devoted to the proposition that all that is good in Greek literature or philosophy, especially in the philosophy of Plato, is derived from the Holy Scriptures. And the last two books (XIV., XV.), attempt to

¹ See above, chapter LV. § 6.

² For example, they were the authors of the oracles delivered to the Greeks (V. 4). This view is implied by Milton in his *Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, stanza 19. Cf. what Justin Martyr says of the mythology of the Greeks (*Trypho*, p. 294 D).

evinced the inconsistencies, contradictions, and errors of all the Greek philosophers. It is obvious that there could not be a more direct and formal attempt than this to discourage the study of the old classical literature, and to throw the Christian student back on the resources of his own narrower range of reading. Although the effects of this style of reasoning are still felt even in Protestant theology, especially among those who, 'without any very distinct views, adopt habitually a religion which is an incongruous mixture of Christianity and Judaism,'¹ there can be no doubt, in the mind of any scholar, that the theory of Eusebius is altogether untenable. It is true that Semitic influences were carried to the coasts of the Mediterranean by the enterprise of the Phœnicians. But these had reference rather to the mythology of the Canaanites than to the theosophy of the Jews, and reacted on the latter, combined, as it seems, with materials derived from the Pelasgians and other semi-Hellenic races. Whether the modifications of Egyptian hieroglyphics, which resulted in the Semitic alphabet, were borrowed from the Phœnicians by the Israelites as they were by the Greeks, or invented first by the Jews, is a question which cannot be decided. But there is no reason whatever for supposing that the Greeks knew anything of Jewish literature until after the establishment of the school of Alexandria, when the classical period of Attic training had already passed away, and there are good grounds² for the belief that in the collection and revision of their sacred books the Masoretic scribes were stimulated by the example and guided by the method of the Greek grammarians, who bestowed such laborious attention on their own ancient poets, and that the Hebrew records were critically arranged in the Greek version of Alexandria before they appeared in their native language. So that the balance of obligation was just the reverse of that which Eusebius has claimed; and similar results, as we have seen, may be obtained from examining the relations between the earliest Christian writers and the great heathen philosophers.³

¹ Powell's *Christianity without Judaism*, London, 1857, p. 69.

² See above, chapter XLVI. § 5.

³ It may be interesting to some readers to consider the following criticism on the *Preparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius from the pen of an eminent scholar, whose

In addition to these works, but with a similar object, Eusebius wrote his 'general chronology'¹ in which he endeavoured to show, by a comparison of dates, that the books attributed to Moses claimed a higher antiquity than any Greek writings, and that Moses himself was prior to the legendary heroes of the Greeks. This therefore was another attempt to discourage the study of the classical authors, and to invest the canonical books with an exclusive interest.

Eusebius was also the author of a life and panegyric in four books of Constantine,² of a treatise on the martyrs of Palestine,³

tendencies were the reverse of sceptical. Mr. Fynes Clinton wrote as follows immediately after perusing this work in the spring of 1819 (*Literary Remains of Henry Fynes Clinton*, London, 1854, pp. 120, 1): 'Nine-tenths of this work of Eusebius consists of extracts from various authors, and that portion which is the composition of Eusebius himself is of very little value. His style is feeble, diffuse, and obscure. He is a very bad reasoner. He is not always constant to his own purpose: having stated a proposition, he sometimes forgets to prove it, and deviates into another track of argument. He devotes three books to prove that the Old Testament was attested by profane writers. To make out this proposition, he takes for granted that those profane Greek writers, who mentioned facts of Jewish history, derived them from independent sources, and not from the Scriptures themselves. In three other books he undertakes to demonstrate that the Greek philosophy was derived from the Scriptures, and this he proves by taking for granted a *contrary* assumption—that, in fact, any doctrine, even any form of expression in which there is an affinity between the two, the philosopher transcribed from the Jewish sacred books. But these two assumptions destroy each other. If, where similar facts are mentioned in profane authors and in Holy Writ, the profane writer borrowed from the sacred, then the facts of Jewish history, mentioned by profane historians, were transcribed by them from the Jewish Scriptures, and these profane historians cannot be appealed to as corroborating witnesses. If, on the contrary, the profane writers did not draw from Scripture sources in matters in which they agree, then the Greek philosophy, whatever its similarity, was not derived from the Jews. This work, however, is highly valuable, not for any merit in the author, or rather compiler, but for the accidental circumstance of preserving to us so many curious fragments not elsewhere extant. It has a value similar in kind, though inferior in degree, to that of the collections of Stobæus or Athenæus.'

¹ *Χρονικά παντοδαπῆς ιστορίας*. This work, which is known to us in the Armenian version published first in 1818, is founded on the chronology of Julius Africanus, (above, chapter LVI. § 4). Its value historically has been discussed by Niebuhr in a paper on the subject communicated to the Royal Academy of Berlin in 1819, and reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften*, I. pp. 179 sqq. See also Bunsen, *Aegypten*, I. p. 251.

² *εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου βασιλέως βιβλία δ'.*

³ *περὶ τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μαρτυρησάντων.*

a sort of gazetteer of the Bible,¹ a review of the life of Apollonius of Tyana, and of the commentary of Hierocles upon it,² a treatise against Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, in two books,³ and a sequel in three books, on ecclesiastical theology,⁴ in confutation of Marcellus.

§ 5. While Eusebius was thus doing his best to disparage the learned culture of the heathen, his contemporary PROHÆRESIUS was exhibiting the first specimen of a Christian sophist, and bringing the accomplishments of the Greek schools of rhetoric to bear on the educational training of the preachers of revealed truth. This eminent orator was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia⁵ in A.D. 276, and died at Athens in A.D. 368. He was taught first by Ulpian at Antioch, and afterwards by Julianus at Athens, where in spite of great opposition Prohæresius ultimately became a public teacher of rhetoric.⁶ He was summoned by the emperor Constans to Gaul in A.D. 342,⁷ and sent from thence to Rome, where he was honoured with a statue bearing the high-sounding inscription: 'the queen of cities to the prince of eloquence.'⁸ And Julian, the emperor, esteemed him so highly that he was willing to except him from the operation of a decree which prohibited Christians from exercising the profession of teacher,⁹ an indulgence which Prohæresius declined to accept. Of his oratory we have no specimens remaining, but it is said to have resembled that of his contemporaries Himerius and Libanius. He had many distinguished pupils, among whom it may be sufficient to mention Gregory

¹ περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ.

² πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα διὰ τὴν Ἱεροκλεῖ παραληφθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σύγκρισιν.

³ κατὰ Μαρκελλου.

⁴ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας τῶν πρὸς Μάρκελλον ἐλέγχων βιβλία γ'.

⁵ Suidas, s.v. Προαιρέσιος, Παγκρατίου, Καππαδόκης ἀπὸ Καισαρείας, σοφιστῆς, μαθητεύσας ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ παρὰ Οὐλιανῷ.

⁶ According to Clinton, *F. R.* p. 401, Julianus died in A.D. 340, and Prohæresius was one of several professors who succeeded him.

⁷ Eunapius, *Vit. Prohæres.* p. 89.

⁸ Eunapius, *Vita Prohæresii*, p. 492, ed. Boissonade, 1849: ἀνδριάντα κατασκευασάμενοι χαλκοῦν ἰσομέτρητον ἀνέθηκαν ἐπιγράφαντες:

Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΥΣΑ ΡΩΜΗ ΤΟΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ.

⁹ Hieron. in *Chronic.* An. 2378.

of Nazianzus,¹ Basil, and Eunapius, to the last of whom we are indebted for an enthusiastic biography of his teacher. It is stated that his personal appearance was very remarkable, his stature gigantic, and his constitutional strength almost unrivalled.²

§ 6. Among the Christians who learned from Prohæresius the graces of heathen rhetoric, no one was more vigorous in his subsequent opposition to heathenism than GREGORY, a native of *Nazianzus* in Cappadocia. He was born about A.D. 329,³ and went to Athens to take a part in all the various studies of the place in A.D. 350. Here he met Basilius, with whom he formed a life-long friendship, and the future emperor Julian; and he protests that he then discovered in his character the causes of those evils which he was destined to bring on church and state.⁴ It is clear, at any rate, that when Julian abandoned the religion in which he had been brought up, he found no assailant more uncompromising than his fellow-student from Nazianzus. About six months after the death of the emperor, Gregory and his friend Basil published a long invective upon him, in which, says Gibbon,⁵ ‘the orator, with some eloquence, much enthusiasm, and more vanity, addresses his discourse to heaven and earth, to men and angels, to the living and the dead, and above all to the great Constantius (εἰ τις αἰσθησις—an odd pagan expression). He concludes with a bold assurance that he has erected a monument not less durable, and much more portable, than the columns of Hercules.’ From the vehemence of the tone of this λόγος στηλιτευτικός, as it is called, one might fancy that Gregory had really feared to incur the anger of the emperor, if his life had been spared. The withdrawal of his brother Cæsarius from the court and service of the emperor indicates some misunderstanding, of which Julian’s apostasy was no doubt the cause. In A.D. 364, when Basil was deposed and retired to Pontus, Gregory accompanied his friend and shared his solitude. But on his promotion to the archbishopric

¹ His epitaph on Prohæresius is given by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 137.

² Casaubon and Wytttenbach, *ad Eunap.* II. p. 285.

³ Gibbon, III. p. 365, note 28, ed. W. Smith. There is a special essay on Gregory of Nazianzus by Ullmann, Darmstadt, 1825.

⁴ Gibbon, II. p. 395, note 29.

⁵ III. p. 136, note.

of Caesarea, Basil could find no better reward for the devotion of Gregory than the wretched see of Sasima, a place which Gibbon describes¹ as 'without water, without verdure, without society, situate at the junction of three highways, and frequented only by the incessant passage of rude and clamorous waggoners.' This nomination was felt by Gregory to be little better than an insult, and he never really accepted it. His father, who bore the same name, was bishop of his native town Nazianzus, and invited Gregory to be his colleague and successor. In this capacity he remained until the death of his father in A.D. 374. He then, wishing to resign his see, retired to Seleucia in Isauria. At last, the orthodox party, of which, after the death of Basil, in January, 379, Gregory was the acknowledged champion, invited him to Constantinople; and he was installed as bishop in the metropolitan city in November, 380. After presiding in the tumultuous council of 381, whose violence he has described in such vivid colours,² he gladly resigned the vexatious office of patriarch, and returned to Nazianzus, where his see was still vacant; here he spent the remaining eight years of his life in the discharge of his duties as a provincial bishop, or in literary leisure and tranquil meditation. He died at his paternal home of Arianus in A.D. 389 or 390.³

Gregory of Nazianzus and his countryman Basil may be called the great Christian sophists;⁴ and, as Gibbon says, they 'were distinguished above all their contemporaries by the rare union of profane eloquence and of orthodox piety.'⁵ As a theologian he stands on the highest ground, and the success with which he defended the main article of the Nicene Creed

¹ III. p. 366, ed. W. Smith.

² *De Vita sua*, tom. II. pp. 25—31.

³ Gibbon, III. 372.

⁴ Suidas (s.v.) is content to say of Gregory that he was *ρήτωρ ἀμφιδέξιος*, and adds: *ἡκολούθησε δὲ τῷ Πολέμωνος χαρακτήρι τοῦ Λαοδικέως*. Joannes Siceliota does not hesitate to prefer him to Demosthenes and all the ancient orators. He says (Bekker, *Anecd.* II. pp. 1447, 8, note): *ὁ θεολόγος οὐ μόνον Δημοσθένην ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντας ὑπερεβάλετο, κἂν τοὺς λόγους παραβάλλῃς, παιδίον εὐρήσεις τὸν Δημοσθένην. καὶ τοῦτο δῆλον τοῦ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς Λεπτίνην· καὶ Ἀριστοκράτην, τοῦ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα*. Again: *ὁ γὰρ Δημοσθένης δν ἐκεῖνοι θαυμάζουσι, πανοῦργος ὢν ἄνθρωπος, κ.τ.λ.* Οὐ μὴν ὁ θεολόγος τοιοῦτος, ἀλλὰ πάντα πρὸς τὸ σπουδερὸν τῷ ἀκούοντι ποιῶν τὰς τάξεις οὐ συγχεῖ τῶν πραγμάτων κ.τ.λ.

⁵ III. p. 365.

has obtained for him the surname of 'the divine' (ὁ θεόλογος), or preacher of Christ's divinity,¹ which he shares only with St. John the Apostle and Evangelist. His rhetoric belongs to the best school of his age; and the elegance of his genius is also shown by a numerous collection of poems, including more than 250 epigrams,² many of which are addressed to his mother Nonna, to Basil, to his brother Cæsarius, and other private friends, and an account of his own life to the time when he left Constantinople, written in iambic trimeters, and containing some passages of great beauty.³

CÆSARIUS, the brother of Gregory Nazianzen, studied philosophy and medicine at Alexandria, and became one of the most eminent physicians of his age. He was court physician to Julian and Valens, and held the office of quæstor of Bithynia.

¹ 'Ὁ θεόλογος,' says Neander (*Church History*, vol. IV. p. 79, Engl. Tr. 1851), 'because *θεολογία*, in the stricter sense, was the term applied to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, as contradistinguished from *οικονομία*, the doctrine of his incarnation.'

² The following verses, supposed to be addressed to him by his mother, Nonna, may be taken as a pleasing specimen of his style, and show at once his tender heart, his piety, and his self-esteem (*Anthol. Palat.* VIII. 32, p. 548):

τέκνον ἐμῆς θηλῆς, ἱερὸν θάλος, ὡς ἐπόθησα
οἴχομαι εἰς ζώην, Γρηγόρι', οὐρανίην·
καὶ γὰρ πόλλ' ἐμόγησας ἐμὸν κομέων πατέρος τε
γῆρας, ἃ καὶ Χριστοῦ βίβλος ἔχει μεγάλη·
ἀλλὰ, φίλος, τοκέεσσιν ἐφέσπεο, καὶ σε τάχιστα
δεξέμεθ' ἡμετέροις φάσει προφρονέως.

³ Gibbon, III. p. 366, note 29, makes a striking remark on the passage in this poem, where he refers to the pangs of injured and lost friendship:

πόννοι κοινοὶ λόγων
ὀμόστεγός τε καὶ συνέστιος βίος
νοῦς εἰς ἐν ἀμφοῖν
διεσκέδασται πάντα κἀρρίπτται χαμαί.
αὔραι φέρονσι τὰς παλαιὰς ἐλπίδας.

'In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Helena addresses the same pathetic complaint to her friend Hermia:

In all the counsel that we two have shared,
The sister's vows, &c.

Shakspeare had never read the poems of Gregory Nazianzen—he was ignorant of the Greek language—but his mother-tongue, the language of nature, is the same in Cappadocia and in Britain.' The *Christus Patiens*, which is found among the writings of Gregory, was probably not written by him, but is a specimen of the scriptural classics undertaken by Apollinaris of Laodicea and his son, when Julian forbade the Christians to teach the literature of heathen Greece.

He died in A.D. 369, about a year after the great earthquake at Nicæa, from which he escaped in a marvellous manner, but was so affected by it that he wished to withdraw from active life and devote himself to the service of religion. Photius¹ attributes to him a work entitled 'ecclesiastical summaries' (κεφάλαια ἐκκλησιαστικά), which he describes as written in a clear and vigorous, though somewhat poetical style, and as very little deficient in theological accuracy. The work was divided into 124 chapters and four dialogues. It is doubted whether it was really written by Gregory's brother, though Photius says so distinctly.²

§ 7. BASILIUS, surnamed 'the Great,' was born at Neo-Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, in A.D. 329,—probably, therefore, in the same year as his friend and countryman Gregory of Nazianzus. His father, who bore the same name, and was an eminent advocate, gave him the best education that could be procured. He studied under Libanius at Constantinople or Antioch, and under Himerius and Prohæresius at Athens.³ He returned to his native city in A.D. 355, with a confirmed reputation as a rhetorician or sophist, and engaged with great success in his father's profession. He was led, however, chiefly by the arguments of his enthusiastic sister Macrinia, to leave these prospects of professional distinction, and to devote himself to religion. The form of devotion which at first recommended itself to his peculiar temper, was monasticism. And he got together a number of persons who entertained the same views or yielded to his influence, including his friend the Nazianzen Gregory. The great authority with the members of the College was Origen; and, as we have mentioned, Gregory and Basil made a chrestomathy from his works, which they entitled *Philocalia*.⁴ After more than one unsuccessful attempt to withdraw him from his seclusion, he was at last settled at Cæsarea as bishop in A.D. 370. In this capacity he still maintained his ascetic

¹ *Cod.* CCX. p. 539.

² εἶναι δέ φασι Γρηγορίου· οὗ τὸ θεόλογος ἐπώνυμον τὸν συγγραφέα ἀδελφὸν δηλοποιεῖ.

³ Socrates, *H. E.* IV. 26; Sozomen, VI. 17. This was in A.D. 355. Clinton, *F. R.* I. p. 431.

⁴ Above, § 3.

habits, and died on the 1st January, A.D. 379, worn out by the hardships to which he had voluntarily submitted.¹

Basil's works, which, as might have been expected from a pupil of Libanius, are marked by the usual characteristics of the later sophistic school, are mostly of a purely theological character, and exhibit occasionally decided proofs of that strong feeling for the beauties of nature which is so frequently the result of a solitary and contemplative life.² They present us with clear indications of his addiction to monastic and ascetic discipline. In regard to our present object the most important of Basil's works is his address 'to the young, showing how they may study Greek literature with advantage' (πρὸς τοὺς νέους ὅπως ἂν ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῦντο λόγων). In this work he adopts very decidedly the view maintained with increasing earnestness by the Christian writers of this age, that all that is good in Greek literature is derived, directly or indirectly, from the Old Testament. So that he, too, is an exemplification of the tendency on which we have been insisting.

Basil's younger brother GREGORY, who is called of *Nyssa*, because he was bishop of that city, and to distinguish him from his celebrated contemporary Gregory of Nazianzus, was born at Neo-Cæsarea, about A.D. 331. After receiving a good education he commenced life as a teacher of rhetoric, but was enlisted in the service of the Church by his brother and the other Gregory, and became bishop of Nyssa, in Cappadocia, about A.D. 372. Being regarded as one of the pillars of Athanasian orthodoxy, he was duly persecuted by the Arians. But he took a prominent part in the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381,³

¹ Clinton, *F. R. I.* pp. 495, 7.

² A. v. Humboldt has given (*Cosmos*, II. p. 393, Otte's Tr.) a beautiful specimen of Basil's power in describing nature from an epistle (*Epist.* XIV. p. 93, Ep. CCXXIII. p. 339, ed. Paris, 1730), 'for which,' he says, 'I have long cherished a special predilection.' The passage ends: 'what other spot could I exchange for this? Alcmaeon, when he had found the Echinades, would not wander farther.' And Humboldt adds: 'In this simple description of scenery and of forest life, feelings are expressed which are more intimately in unison with modern times than anything that has been transmitted to us from Greek or Roman antiquity. The poetical and mythical allusion at the close of the letter falls on the Christian ear like an echo from another and an earlier world.'

³ Neander says (*Church History*, IV. p. 83, Engl. Tr.) that 'Gregory of Nyssa,

and died in full possession of his honours near the end of the fourth century.

Gregory Nyssen was, like his brother Basil, an eminent rhetorician; and, like him, he retained to the last his fondness for the works of Origen, whose opinions he adopted in many particulars.¹ His works are chiefly homiletical. With reference to the question now before us, the most important is his treatise 'on destiny,' in which, like Eusebius, he endeavours to confute the Greek philosophical notions on the subject. Two other works of a semi-philosophical nature are, his treatise 'on the soul,' and the dialogue called 'Macrinia, or the resurrection,' in which the interlocutors are the writer and his sister Macrinia, and the subject is suggested by the recent death of Basil.

§ 8. The last of the great Christian sophists who came forth from the schools of heathen rhetoric was JOHN, the son of Secundus, a general in the imperial army, who is generally known by the surname CHRYSOSTOMUS, given to him, as to the eminent sophist Dio Cocceianus, on account of his golden eloquence.² He was born at Antioch, about A.D. 347, and was taught rhetoric in his native city by Libanius,³ who would gladly have established him in his school as his assistant and successor, if Chrysostom had not been drawn away from secular pursuits by his religious convictions. After some time spent in the seclusion of a neighbouring monastery, Chrysostom reappeared at Antioch not only as a baptized Christian, but as a minister of religion; and he attained such general reputation by his matchless eloquence as a preacher, that Eutropius, who had heard

by the superiority of his well-trained intellect, seems to have acquired special influence over the doctrinal transactions of the Council.'

¹ Neander, *Ch. Hist.* IV. p. 449: 'Origen had the greatest influence on the formation of the theological system of Gregory of Nyssa, although Gregory was a perfectly independent theologian, and reproduced, with the fulness of original thought, whatever he learned from the labours of others.'

² Suidas, s.v. 'Ιωάννης: οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος τοιαύτην λόγων εὐπόρησεν εὐροίαν, ἣν μόνος αὐτὸς ἐπλούτησε, καὶ μόνος ἀκίβδηλος τὸ χρυσοῦν τε καὶ θεῖον ἐκκληρονόμησεν ὄνομα.

³ Photius, *Cod.* XCVI.; Socrates, VI. 3. He left Libanius at the age of eighteen, was then three years with Meletius, six in retirement, five years a deacon, and twelve a presbyter; see Clinton, *F. R.* I. pp. 473, 487, II. p. 454.

some of his sermons, appointed him archbishop of Constantinople, on the death of Nectarius in A.D. 397. That the people of Antioch might not resist the removal of their favourite and townsman, he was removed to Constantinople in a covered chariot. In his new and dignified position, the popular preacher of Antioch thought only of his religious duties. Unlike the heathen sophists, from whose school he had derived the armoury of his eloquence, he had no thought of winning plaudits by pandering to the sins, or flattering the vanity of his hearers. His free-spoken denunciations of prevalent vices, which did not spare even the empress,¹ and the abstinence which led him to shrink from the hospitalities of his exalted station,² contributed to make him an unwelcome monitor, and to weaken his social influence. Some measures of severity increased the feeling against him, and, after much resistance on the part of the populace, he was banished from Constantinople on the 20th June, A.D. 404, and obliged to undertake a difficult and dangerous journey in the heat of summer to Cucusus, a desolate town in Lesser Armenia. Here he resided for three years, keeping up an active correspondence with all parts of his metropolitan province, till at last his enemies, wearied by his continued activity, procured an order for his removal to Pityus, at the extreme point of the eastern Roman empire. He was obliged to set out on foot; but the journey was too much for his strength, and he died on the 14th September, A.D. 407, at Comana, in Pontus, before he had reached his destination.³

We have ample means of forming a judgment respecting the

¹ It seems that he called the empress Eudoxia by the very uncomplimentary name of Jezebel, and even intimated on one occasion that, like Herodias, she demanded the head of John, *i.e.* of himself. It is stated that he found active enemies in three opulent widows, whose vanity had been wounded by his personalities. See the references to the dialogue of Palladius in Gibbon, IV. p. 153, note 43, ed. W. Smith.

² He is defended, however, from this charge by his biographer Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, on six distinct pleas: see Gibbon, *u.s.* note 45.

³ The ancient authorities for the biography of Chrysostom are the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates (book VI.), Sozomen (book VII.), and Theodoret (book V.), and the dialogue by Palladius, published in the thirteenth vol. of Chrysostom's works—but no one can desire a more distinct and lively account of his career than that which is given by Gibbon, vol. IV. pp. 151—158. And all the authorities, with a careful reckoning of the dates, are contained in Clinton's *Fasti Romani*.

literary merits of John Chrysostom. Nearly a thousand of his homilies have been preserved, and we can see from them that he deserved the high reputation which he enjoyed in his lifetime. He may be considered as the founder of the art of preaching, that is, as the first who brought to perfection the business of writing a short but complete *ἐπίδειξις*, or declamation, on a given text of Scripture. He may be also considered as the first who interpreted the canonical writings of the New Testament with a due regard to the grammatical and intended meaning of the authors, but without any servile worship of the letter.¹ To say that he is a florid writer, that he delights in laboured metaphors, and that his style is overloaded with artificial embellishments, is merely to say what is presumed in the fact that he was trained in the schools of the later Greek sophists. But there is nothing offensive in the ornaments of his diction, and those who have been accustomed to read or hear eloquent sermons, from the days of Jeremy Taylor down to our own time, will find little in the homilies of Chrysostom which may not be paralleled in the effusions of the most popular preachers. Sometimes, indeed, his language rises far above the limits of rhetorical ingenuity, and breathes a spirit which it could only gain from the sincere earnestness of the writer, and the impulses of true genius.² If we wish to see how such a man could use an incident for the purposes of religious instruction, we cannot have a better example than the course of sermons which he preached at Antioch, where the statues of Theodosius and Flacilla had been thrown down by a mob, and the people were trembling in fearful expectation of the emperor's vengeance. There is no specimen of sacred eloquence which can surpass these discourses to a great city looking forward to a just punish-

¹ The sober remarks which he makes on the discrepancies of the Gospels (*Hom. in Matth.* I. 3, pp. 4, 5, ed. Field) are a valid defence of the human honesty of the writers, but quite needless on the hypothesis of infallibility: ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐν μικροῖς εἶναι διαφωνία ἀπαλλάττει αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας καὶ λαμπρῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρόπου τῶν γραψάντων ἀπολογεῖται. On this point see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* III. p. 399, Engl. Tr.

² We may refer for example to his XXXIV. *Homily on St. Matthew*, pp. 485—487, Field, where the contrast between the perishable beauty of the body and the true beauty of the soul, is admirably developed: οὐ γὰρ τὸ σῶμά ἐστι τὸ καλὸν ἀλλ' ἡ διάπλασις καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ὅπερ παρὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιχρῶννται τῇ οὐσίᾳ.

ment from an absolute sovereign, to whom they had offered an unprovoked insult.

§ 9. The five Christian sophists whom we have mentioned in succession, are all distinguished by the prefix of 'Saint,' and are known principally from their connexion with ecclesiastical literature. We must, however, mention two bishops whose reputation rests on works of a more general kind.

We know little of NEMESIUS, Bishop of Emesa, in Phœnicia, except that he must have flourished about A.D. 400.¹ He has left us a work 'on the nature of man' (*περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*), which is not only distinguished by the comparative purity of its style, but by the proofs which the author gives of his having carefully studied the best classical authors. He shows, however, the intention to disparage the ancient wisdom which is so common among the Christian writers of this period, and like Gregory of Nyssa, to whom his treatise has been ascribed, from a confusion of its title with that of Gregory's 'on the fabric of man' (*περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου*),² he takes especial pains to refute the heathen doctrine of destiny. He had a favourable opportunity of contrasting revelation with philosophy in his second chapter, where he criticized the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

SYNESIUS, who was born at Cyrene in A.D. 378,³ must be classed rather with the school of Justin, Clement, and Origen, than with the Christian sophists, whom we have been considering in the last few sections. Perhaps he was the only eminent Christian in the fourth or fifth century, who ventured to maintain the parallel importance of heathen and Christian literature. He was born a pagan, and was not converted to Christianity till he was about thirty years old. He had been a hearer and sincere admirer of Hypatia, and even after he became a Christian

¹ This is inferred from his mention of Apollinaris and Eunomius (pp. 77, 73, ed. Fell. Oxon. 1671), the former of whom was a contemporary and friend of Libanius, while the latter died a very old man in A.D. 394.

² It seems doubtful whether the author of the treatise *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου* ought to be identified with Nemeseius, the prefect of Cappadocia, who was a friend of Gregory of Nazianzus.

³ In his *Epist.* 57, p. 197 D, he claims a direct and recorded descent from the Dorian kings of Sparta.

and bishop of Ptolemais towards the end of A.D. 409,¹ he was far from embracing all the tenets of orthodoxy. He did not hesitate to confess in the most candid manner, that his doctrines were rather those of Origen than those of Theophilus, and though he declared that his thoughts should never rise in open revolt against his tongue,² he conceived himself at liberty to maintain an esoteric faith in accordance with his philosophical convictions, as well as the popular views of Christianity which he preached to his less instructed hearers. He lived to about A.D. 430. His works are rather philosophical than theological. Besides his one hundred and fifty-four epistles, which are of considerable interest, and a few hymns remarkable for their mixture of Platonism and Christianity, Synesius has left us (*a*) a speech 'on monarchy' (περὶ βασιλείας), addressed to Arcadius in A.D. 399,³ when Synesius was deputed by Cyrene to present the emperor with a golden crown; (*b*) a tract entitled 'Dion, or on his own plan of life' (Δίων ἡ περὶ τῆς καθ' ἑαυτὸν διαγωγῆς), written just after his marriage in 404, and addressed to his unborn son; its object, which is explained in a letter to Hypatia, is to explain his intention to become a philosopher after the example of Dion Chrysostom; (*c*) another tract referring to Dion and called 'the praise of baldness' (φαλάκρας ἐγκώμιον), in imitation of that rhetorician's 'praise of the hair' (κόμης ἐγκώμιον), which we know only from this parody; (*d*) 'the Egyptian, or on providence' (Αἰγύπτιος ἡ περὶ προνοίας), in two books, an allegory derived from the fable of Osiris and Typhon, and referring to the history of his own time; if the commentators are right, it hardly goes on all fours; (*e*) a Platonic treatise 'on dreams;' (*f*) an oration on Aysius, prefect of Libya (called κατάστασις); (*g*) a discourse to Pæonius on the present of an astrolabe which Synesius had made him (περὶ Παιόνιον ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου λόγος); (*h*) 'an oration on the incursion of the barbarians' in A.D. 412 (κατάστασις ῥηθεῖσα ἐπὶ

¹ See the calculation in Clinton, *F. R.* II. p. 471, note m.

² *Ep.* 105, ed. Basil: οὐ στασιάσει μοι πρὸς τὴν γλῶτταν ἡ γνώμη.

³ Clinton, *F. R.* I. p. 547: 'the mission to Constantinople is fixed to A.D. 398—400 inclusive. In this period he addressed to Arcadius the discourse περὶ βασιλείας, in which Pagi points out an allusion to Tribigildus, which places it in A.D. 399.'

τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐφόδῳ); (i) two *Homilies*. Synesius also wrote tragedies and comedies which are lost. He is altogether an excellent writer, and has always been held in very high estimation.

§ 10. We must conclude this chapter with a brief notice of a contemporary of Synesius, who distinguished himself, among other things, by answering the emperor Julian, nearly sixty years after his death, by a persecution of Nestorius, and by sanctioning, if he did not cause, the murder of the learned, pious, and beautiful Hypatia. CYRIL of Alexandria, as he is called to distinguish him from the bishop of Jerusalem, who bore the same name and flourished in the middle of the fourth century, was a nephew of Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria who converted Synesius to Christianity, and he succeeded his uncle on the 18th October, A.D. 412.¹ The nature of the present work does not require that we should follow in its details the unchristian career of this turbulent, odious, and worthless man.² It is sufficient to say that his ecclesiastical administration at Alexandria down to the time of his death in A.D. 444,³ is characterized by all the worst features of priestly arrogance, selfishness, and tyranny. Nor are his glaring faults as a man and as a professor of Christianity counterbalanced or cast into the shade by his merits as a writer. He revived, in its worst form, the allegorizing system of interpretation, for his object is not the honest one of Philo and Clemens to find, what they sincerely expected to find, an inner harmony between revealed and philosophical truth, but his wish is rather to distort the meaning of documents, which he professed to consider infallible, into an accordance with his own Egyptian mysticism. Even Photius cannot abstain from an unqualified condemnation of his style. He says:⁴ 'his style is artificial and forced into a character

¹ Clinton, *F. R. I.* p. 583.

² See the judgment of Neander, *Church History*, IV. pp. 133 sqq. In addition to his other demerits, he seems to have been guilty of the grossest avarice and the most scandalous corruption. 'It was rumoured of Cyril,' says Neander, 'that bishoprics could be obtained of him for money by persons wholly unworthy of the office.'

³ Clinton, *F. R. II.* p. 470, note k.

⁴ *Cod. XLIX.*: ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ πεποιημένος καὶ εἰς ιδιάζουσιν ἰδέαν ἐκβεβιασμένος καὶ οἷον λελυμένη καὶ τὸ μέτρον ὑπερωῶσα ποιήσις.

peculiar to himself, being like poetry set free and despising the laws of metre.' Even the name of 'Saint,' by which his accordance with established orthodoxy is indicated rather than proved, has not saved him from the contempt and neglect of modern believers.¹ His 'defence of the holy worship of Christians against the book of the atheist Julian' (ὕπερ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν εὐαγοῦς θρησκείας πρὸς τὰ τοῦ ἐν ἀθέοις Ἰουλιανοῦ), has not given satisfaction to the most favourable judges;² and its principal value consists in the extracts which it gives us from the work of his deceased antagonist. When he quotes from Julian the contrast between the results of a training in Greek and Roman literature, and of a discipline in the sacred books of the Jews and Christians respectively,³ his answer has no value or significance, because it is belied by the effects which a narrow-minded bigotry produced on his own character and conduct, and by the very different results which we notice in those who, like St. Paul and St. James, or Justin and Clement, have combined with their faith the best learning of their own and preceding ages. In order to appreciate this, we have only to contrast the writings of the two Saints, who derive their distinctive names from Alexandria; to place on the one side Clement with his solid and diversified learning, and his truly classical spirit, and, on the other, this Cyril with his mystical and scholastic subtleties, his prose run mad, and his inability to appreciate the truths of literature and science.

¹ Gibbon has the following note (VI. p. 12): 'La Croze (*Hist. du Christ. des Indes*, I. 24) avows his contempt for the genius and writings of Cyril—de tous les ouvrages des anciens, il y en a peu qu'on lise avec moins d'utilité,—and Dupin, (*Bibl. Ecclés.* IV. p. 42—52), in words of respect, teaches us to despise them.'

² Gibbon, III. p. 145, note 31.

³ VII. p. 229 D: ἐκ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν γραφῶν οὐδ' ἂν γένοιτο γενναῖος ἀνὴρ μᾶλλον οὐδ' ἐπιεικής. ἐκ δὲ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πᾶς ἂν γένοιτο καλλίων. *Ibid.*: ἐκ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐπιλεξάμενοι παιδία ταῖς γραφαῖς ἐμμελετῆσαι παρασκευάσατε· κἂν φανῇ τῶν ἀνδραπύδων, εἰς ἀνδρα τελέσαντα, σπουδαιότερα, ληρεῖν ἐμὲ καὶ μελαγχολᾶν νομίζετε. Cf. pp. 218 B, 238 E.

CHAPTER LIX.

ECHOES OF THE OLD LITERATURE.—ROMANCES.—THE
EPIC SCHOOL OF NONNUS.

§ 1. Echoes of the old classical spirit grow fainter after the commencement of the fifth century. § 2. Mathematicians at Alexandria: Cleomedes, Diophantus, Pappus, Theon, and Hypatia. § 3. Cosmas the geographer. § 4. Romances as substitutes for poetry: Heliodorus. § 5. Achilles Tatius. § 6. Longus. § 7. Chariton and Emathius. § 8. Fictitious letters. Alciphron and Aristænetus. § 9. The mythographic epos: Nonnus. § 10. Quintus Smyrnæus. § 11. Coluthus and Tryphiodorus. § 12. Musæus.

§ 1. FROM the time when Christian dogmatism, with its counter-jargons of orthodoxy and heresy, placed itself in opposition to the old culture of heathen Greece and Rome, down to the period when the revival of classical literature, the invention of printing, and the establishment of Protestant principles, appeared as contemporary or successive events in the century which witnessed and followed the taking of Constantinople, the old classical spirit was nearly extinct both in the Eastern and the Western empire. In Italy, the triumph of barbarism was more sudden and complete; and from the death of Boethius in A.D. 524,¹ it cannot be said that there was any genuine philosophy or literature in the old centre of Roman power, until it came to life again in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries under the inspiration of some men of genius. In the Eastern empire, it is true that there was a certain literary activity, and books were written in Greek, with varying purity, for nine centuries after this time. Indeed, in one department, that of history, we shall see that Byzantine literature was conspicuously prolific. It is also true that, when the decadence of Greek literature seemed most complete, it revived for awhile under the patronage of a new dynasty at Constantinople.

¹ Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, I. p. 3.

Theophilus in the ninth century had re-opened a school for mathematics and philosophy in one of his palaces; and the Macedonian dynasty, which succeeded him, laboured to revive a demand for literature and learning. A still stronger taste for letters was manifested by the Commeni in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and the last imperial house, that of the Palæologi, who reigned from the thirteenth century to the end of the Western empire, endeavoured to repair the damage inflicted on Greek learning by the illiterate Latin dynasty which occupied the throne from 1204 to 1261. But in spite of all these occasional advantages, the echoes of the past became fainter and fainter; the interest in the best writers, and the power to understand them, rapidly diminished; even classical works, which had existed up to the thirteenth century, notwithstanding the wholesale destruction of public libraries, gradually became extinct from want of copyists; and when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks in A.D. 1453, the wandering Greeks, who found their way into Italy, could only serve as language-masters to a race of scholars, who were destined to recover philologically the learning which had ceased to exist among the Greeks themselves.

In the following chapter we shall give a general view of this long period of decadence; but before we come to this, we must notice the last manifestations of the old classical learning by the Alexandrian school which had done so much in the third and second centuries before our æra. These manifestations may be divided into three classes. In the first class we place some exhibitions of the mathematical and geographical studies, which had been brought to such perfection by Euclid, by Apollonius of Perga, by Eratosthenes, and, after them, by Ptolemy. In the second class we have the substitution of prose romances for the bucolic and erotic poetry of the Sicilian and Alexandrian writers. In the third class, we must consider the revival by Nonnus and his followers of a learned mythographic epos of much the same kind as those poems which Callimachus had indited some seven centuries before.

§ 2. It is probable that the mathematical school at Alexandria had never been without some representatives. We do not know when CLEOMEDES flourished, or in what connexion he stood

with Alexandria. Some have supposed that he lived in the Augustan age,¹ others have placed him in the fourth century,² and good arguments have been adduced for referring him to a still later period.³ He either knew nothing of Ptolemy, or has passed him over in silence for some reason of his own.⁴ His work 'on the spherical theory of the heavenly bodies' (*κυκλικὴ θεωρία μετεώρων*) is based principally on Eratosthenes and Poseidonius. There is also a good deal of uncertainty as to the date of DIOPHANTUS, who occupies the same place with regard to arithmetical algebra that Euclid does with regard to geometry. While one eminent writer would place him 'towards the end of the fifth century of our æra at the earliest,'⁵ others have determined his date approximately to the reign of Julian (A.D. 361—363),⁶ and this seems to us most probable.⁷ Of the thirteen books on arithmetic (*ἀριθμητικῶν βιβλία*) attributed to him, we have only the first six, and the thirteenth, which is on polygonal numbers.

The mathematical commentator and compiler, PAPPUS of Alexandria, is expressly stated to have flourished in the reign of Theodosius (A.D. 379—395).⁸ Besides a fragment of his commentaries on Ptolemy,⁹ he has left us the last six of the eight books of his 'Mathematical Collections' (*μαθηματικὰ συναγωγαί*),¹⁰ which are a series of extracts from a great number of

¹ This is the opinion of Bayer, Bailly, Delambre, and Laplace. A still earlier date is assigned to him by Montucla (*Hist. de la Mathém.* I. p. 279).

² Letronne argues that he could not have flourished earlier than A.D. 186, and infers that he must have been subsequent to Ptolemy (*Journal d. Sav.* 1821, p. 713).

³ Riccioli (*Almag. Nov.* I. pp. XXXII. 307) suggests that there were two writers of the name, one who lived soon after Poseidonius, the other, who wrote the *κυκλικὴ θεωρία*, after A.D. 390.

⁴ See Delambre, *Hist. de l'Astr. anc.* I. c. 12.

⁵ Professor De Morgan in Smith's *Dictionary*, I. p. 1050, apparently because he is not mentioned by Pappus and Proclus.

⁶ Abulfaragius, *Hist. Dynast.* p. 141, ed. Pocock; Saxe, *Onomast.* I. p. 417.

⁷ Suidas (s.v. *Ῥαρία*) says that Hypatia *ἐγραψεν ὑπόμνημα εἰς Διόφαντον*, and there is no reason to suppose that the Diophantus referred to was not the celebrated arithmetician, who was therefore older than Hypatia, and in all probability one of her immediate predecessors.

⁸ Suidas, s.v. *Πάππος*, *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, φιλόσοφος, γεγονώς κατὰ τὸν πρεσβύτερον Θεοδοσίον τὸν βασιλέα ὅτε καὶ Θέων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἤκμαζεν*.

⁹ Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VIII. pp. 208 sqq.

¹⁰ This work has not yet been published complete in the original text.

works, and are of the highest importance for the history of mathematics.¹

That THEON of Alexandria was a contemporary of Pappus is known from the distinct statement of Suidas,² and from the fact that he observed an eclipse of the sun and of the moon in A.D. 365. He is often confused with Theon of Smyrna, a mathematician and Platonist of the time of Hadrian.³ His writings are Commentaries on Euclid, Aratus, and Ptolemy, the last being his most considerable work.⁴

The celebrity of Theon is obscured by that of his daughter HYPATIA, whose sex, youth, beauty, and cruel fate, have made her the most interesting martyr of philosophy.⁵ After receiving instruction in mathematics from her father, who was a professor at the Museum in his native city, she went to Athens, where she became such a proficient in the Platonic philosophy, that, on her return to Alexandria, she presided in the public schools there, and taught at once the mathematics of Apollonius and Diophantus, and the philosophy of Ammonius and Plotinus. Her influence over the studious and educated classes in Alexandria, especially the intimacy which subsisted between her and the prefect Orestes, excited the hatred and jealousy of the narrow-minded and unprincipled archbishop; and Cyril found no difficulty in directing the brutal violence of a superstitious mob against one who was described as an enemy of the faith and its ministers. Headed by an ecclesiastic named Peter, a band of fanatics attacked Hypatia, in the spring of A.D. 415, as she was passing through the streets in her chariot, dragged her to one of the churches, where they pulled her clothes from her back, and then cast her out into the street, pelted her to death with fragments of earthenware, tore her

¹ See Montucla, *Hist. d. Mathém.* I. pp. 328 sqq.

² s.v. Πάππος ut supra, and s.v. Θέων· σύγχρονος δὲ Πάππῳ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ.

³ Every question connected with Theon of Smyrna is fully discussed in J. J. de Gelder's edition of his τὰ κατ' ἀριθμητικὴν χρήσιμα eis τὴν τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἀνάγνωσιν, Lugd. Bat. 1827; all the writers of the name of Theon are enumerated in pp. XXII. sqq.

⁴ See Delambre, vol. II. pp. 550—616.

⁵ She appears as the heroine of a powerful and suggestive fiction in Mr. Kingsley's *Hypatia, or New Foes with an Old Face*.

body to pieces, and committed her mutilated remains to the flames.¹

§ 3. The murder of Hypatia was a summary measure for silencing heathen enlightenment. In the following century, a more elaborate and harmless attempt was made to obviate the difficulties which the system of Ptolemy created in the minds of devout Christians. COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES is the name given to an orthodox book of geography and travels which appeared in the middle of the sixth century, and was expressly designed to vindicate the Scriptural account of the world. It is very possible that both parts of this name are merely descriptive designations, the former indicating the author as a general cosmographer, and the latter pointing to his travels in the Indian ocean. Photius² describes the work, without any author's name, as 'the book of Christians, an exposition on the Octateuch' (Χριστιανῶν βιβλος, ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον), the latter part of the title referring to its connexion with the eight books of Ptolemy's geography.³ In the manuscripts it is called 'the topography of Christians' (τοπογραφία Χριστιανῶν). It is divided into twelve books, and its object is to show, in opposition to Ptolemy, and in accordance with the Scriptures, that the world is not a sphere, but an oblong plain, covered by a vaulted roof or firmament, and surrounded by an ocean, beyond which, *inter alia*, is the Paradise of Adam. The sun and moon are supposed to perform their daily course under the cupola, and, with the planets, revolve around a conical mountain to the north. In the summer, the sun takes a turn round the summit of the said cone, and is therefore concealed from our view only for a short period of night; in the winter, he circum-

¹ See Gibbon (VI. p. 14); he translates the words: *ὀστράκοις ἀνείλον καὶ μεληδὸν διασπᾶντες*, &c., 'her flesh was scraped from her bones with sharp oyster-shells,' and his learned editor, Dr. W. Smith, says, 'her throat was probably cut with an oyster-shell.' There is no reason to suppose that *ὀστρακον* ever meant 'an oyster-shell' (*ὀστρεον*), nor would oysters abound in Alexandria. The mob used fragments of tiles and broken earthenware instead of stones, which they would not so readily find on that sandy shore.

² *Cod. XXXVI. p. 21.*

³ We are quite unable to understand what the writer in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary*, I. p. 864, means by saying 'the latter (*i.e.* the reference to the *Octateuch*), because the first part of the work treats of the tabernacle of Moses and other things described in the *Pentateuch*.'

navigates the base, which is a longer operation. In one particular he has given rise to a tissue of absurdities even greater than his own; for he has led to the belief, gravely maintained within the last few years, that the comparatively recent inscriptions in the peninsula of Sinai, are the records of a primeval language.¹ With all this nonsense, which occupies the greater part of the book, the cosmographer gives us some valuable information respecting Ceylon and India, which he had visited, especially with regard to the diffusion of Christianity in those distant countries. The book is also interesting, as showing how soon the doctrine of an infallible literature, and of Church authority, leads to an interference with the most certain results of science and observation.

§ 4. We have seen how the bucolic writers of the Alexandrian school combined the erotic element with the views of pastoral life, which they endeavoured to paint. When rhetorical prose superseded verse composition, the greater facility of the style not unnaturally led to the substitution of more detailed narratives and adventures for the brief scenes of the eclogue, or love-poem, and the sophist, who would have been a poet in the time of Callimachus and Theocritus, became the writer of a love-story or prose-romance in the declining period of Greek literature. It would be scarcely possible to ascertain when prose fictions were first introduced among the Greeks. Photius, who considers ANTONIUS DIOGENES as the father of all Greek romances,² does not know when he lived; and his conjecture that he flourished not very long after the time of Alexander Severus,³ may or may not be well founded. It is more likely that he was one of the sophists who lived about the time which we are considering. His story was called ‘on the

¹ We refer to the theory lately put forth by the Rev. C. Forster respecting the antiquity and authorship of the Sinaitic inscriptions. Bunsen says (*Christianity and Mankind*, III, 231) that Cosmas ‘could find nobody able to read the characters, and hence concluded them to be the records of the Israelites on their passage through the desert.’ On Mr. Forster’s extravagances the remarks of Bunsen (pp. 238, 9) are an adequate comment.

² *Cod.* CLXVI. p. 364 : ὁ τῶν τοιούτων πλασμάτων πατήρ.

³ *Ibid.* : οὐ λίαν πῶρόν τῶν χρόνων τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου. Some have supposed that Photius is referring to Alexander the Great, but the Roman name of Diogenes sufficiently refutes this notion.

incredible things beyond Thule' (τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγου κδ'), in twenty-four books, and recites the wonderful adventures of Deinias and Dercyllis. The first ascertained beginning of this style of light reading, which occupies so large a space in the catalogues of modern libraries, was in the time of the emperor Trajan, when a Syrian or Babylonian freedman of the name of IAMBlichus—of course to be distinguished from the Neo-Platonist of the same name¹—published a love story, called 'the Babylonian adventures' (Βαβυλωνιακά), according to Suidas,² but designated by Photius, to whom we owe an analysis of the plot, as 'a dramatic fiction' (δραματικόν).³ It is an account of the lives and adventures of Rhodanes and Sinonis, with the latter of whom Garmus, king of Babylon, becomes enamoured; whence the second title. Another work of the same kind has come down to us under the name of XENOPHON of Ephesus, of whose age we know nothing. It is not even certain that there ever was an author so called, and it is supposed that the writer took the name of Xenophon, merely because he imitated the style of the well-known Athenian. His romance is called 'the Ephesian adventures' (Ἐφεσιακά), and tells of the loves of Anthia and Abrocomes.⁴ The local titles of these story-books were probably suggested by 'the Milesian adventures' (Μιλησιακά), collected by DIONYSIUS and ARISTEIDES of Miletus, much older writers, whose age, however, is unknown. PARTHENIUS of Nicæa, who is supposed to have lived in the Augustan age, and who dedicates his little work 'on amatory affections' (περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων) to Cornelius Gallus, derives some of his sketches from 'the Milesian adventures' of Hegesippus,⁵ and cites also Naxian,⁶ Pallenian,⁷ Lydian,⁸ Trojan,⁹ and Bithynian¹⁰ tales. On the same principle, HELIODORUS of

¹ See above, p. 202.

² s.v. Ἰάμβλιχος.

³ Phot. Cod. XCIV. p. 235.

⁴ Lapaume considers this romance the original of the story of Romeo and Juliet (*Præf. ad Erot. de Apoll. Tyr. Fab.* p. 603).

⁵ Parthenii *Erotica*, c. 16, p. 14, ed Hirschig. 1856: ἱστορεῖ Ἡγήσιππος Μιλησιακῶν α'. So also c. 14, p. 12: ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ οἱ τὰ Μιλησιακά.

⁶ c.g. p. 9: ἡ ἱστορία ἐλήφθη ἐκ τῆς δ' Ἀνδρίσκου Ναξιακῶν. Cf. c. 19, p. 16.

⁷ c. 6, p. 6: ἱστορεῖ Θεογένης καὶ Ἡγήσιππος ἐν Παλληνιακοῖς.

⁸ c. 33, p. 21: ἱστορεῖ Ξάνθος Λυδιακοῖς.

⁹ c. 4, p. 5: Κεφάλων ὁ Γεργίθιος ἐν Τρωικοῖς.

¹⁰ c. 35, p. 22: ἱστορεῖ Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ Μυρλεανὸς Βιθυνιακῶν δ.

Emesa, the most important romance writer in the age which we are now considering, entitled his love tale 'the Æthiopic adventures' (Αἰθιοπικά). This author was the son of Theodosius, and belonged, if we may judge from an expression which he uses, to a family of priests of the sun.¹ He was, however, a Christian, and became bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, about the end of the fourth century.² His novel, which is, perhaps, the best of its class, is elegantly written, and has, no doubt, served as a model both for the Greek romances of the following age, and for the fictions of the seventeenth century. Its subject is the amours and adventures of Theagenes and Chariclea. The following is a sketch of the plot. A noble Thessalian, Theagenes, and Chariclea, a Delphian priestess, fall in love at first sight (ἀπὸ τῆς ὀψεως), and, with the aid of an Egyptian priest, Calasius, an elopement takes place. The lovers fall into the hands of pirates and robbers, whose chief in each case falls in love with Chariclea. Eventually they all find their way to Egypt. They are carried off by an invasion of the Æthiopians; and as Theagenes is about to be offered as a victim to the sun, and Chariclea to the moon, the latter asks leave to defend herself before Sisimithrus, the chief of the gymnosophists. It turns out that she is the daughter of the Æthiopian king, whose wife had brought forth a white daughter,³ from thinking of a Greek statue, and had intrusted the child to Sisimithrus, with certain tokens to enable her eventually to recognize it; he had given the infant to Calasius, Calasius to Charicles, and Charicles had brought her up as his own daughter. Theagenes is also released from his sentence, human sacrifices are abolished for ever, and the lovers are united, according to the legitimate practice of novel writers. The story, as will be seen even from this account of it, is ingeniously absurd; but the descriptions are often very beautiful,⁴ and it has the merit of sinning less

¹ *Æthiop.* X. fin. p. 412, ed. Hirschig.: ἀνὴρ Φοίνιξ Ἑμεσηνός, τῶν ἀπ' Ἡλίου γένος, Θεοδοσίου παῖς, Ἡλίοδωρος.

² Socrates, *H. E.* V. 22.

³ This marvellous incident is borrowed by Tasso in the case of his *Clorinda*, *Gerus. Lib.* XII. 23 sqq.

⁴ The following brief picture of the subsidence of a favourable breeze towards evening is a fair specimen of the writer's power of word-painting (*Æthiop.* V. 23, p. 312): ἦν μὲν ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ὅτε ἀρότρου βοῦν ἐλευθεροῖ γηπόνος, ὃ δ' ἀνεμος τῆς

against morality and good taste than the rest of the Greek love stories.

§ 5. Of the age of ACHILLES TATIUS, or STATIUS, we know nothing beyond that which is supplied by the obvious fact that he directly imitated Heliodorus, and must therefore have been subsequent to him. He was probably a contemporary of Musæus, who also imitates Heliodorus, and who did not compose his poem before the middle of the fifth century. Suidas states that Achilles was born a pagan, but became eventually a Christian and a bishop.¹ Whether this is true or not, the romance by which he is known bears no marks of the influence of ecclesiastical literature. It is the work of a heathen sophist, whose main business is to form his style on the best pagan models, and who especially imitates the diction of Plato. If Achilles had been a bishop, the improbable story that Heliodorus was obliged to choose between recalling his book or resigning his see,² would be much more applicable to him, for his romance is infinitely more likely to corrupt the morals of youth than that of the bishop of Tricca. The story is entitled 'the adventures of Leucippe and Cleitophon' (τὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα), in eight books. Its chief merit consists in the descriptions in which it abounds; the incidents are complicated and tedious, and the character of the hero is below contempt. The probability of the narrative is quite overthrown by the awkward machinery. The hero, Cleitophon, tells his own story, from the third chapter of the first book, down to the end of the romance, without any interruption from the unknown listener, who happens to be looking, with him, at a picture of the rape of Europa. The *dramatis personæ* are Hippias of Tyre, who has two children by different mothers, Cleitophon and Calligone; Sostratus, the brother of Hippias, his wife Panthia, and his daughter Leucippe; Cleinias, the cousin of Cleitophon; a cunning slave, Satyrus; Meuclaus, an

ἄγαν φορᾶς ὤκλαζε καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον ἐνδιδοὺς ἀπρακτὸς τε καὶ μαλακὸς τοῖς ἰστίοις ἐνέπιπτε καὶ σοβῶν μᾶλλον ἢ προωθῶν τὴν ὁδόνην τέλος εἰς γαλήνην ἐξεκινήθη, καθάπερ τῷ ἡλίῳ συγκαταδυόμενος ἢ ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, τοῖς ἐπιδιώκουσιν ὑπηρετούμενος.

¹ s.v. 'Αχιλλεύς Στάτιος, 'Αλεξανδρεῖς, ὁ γράψας τὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα καὶ ἄλλα ἐρωτικά ἐν βιβλίοις ἡ. Γέγονεν ἔσχατον Χριστιανὸς καὶ Ἐπίσκοπος.

² Nicephorus, *H. E.* XII. 34.

Egyptian, whose acquaintance Cleitophon makes when he runs away with Leucippe from Berytus to Alexandria; certain pirates and soldiers; Melitte, a supposed widow of Ephesus, but residing at Alexandria, who falls in love with Cleitophon, and induces him to marry her, in the belief that Leucippe is dead;¹ Thersander, the husband of Melitte, who had escaped from shipwreck without her knowledge; and Sosthenes, the slave of Thersander. All these parties make their entries on the stage with melodramatic exactness; everybody appears at the critical time; and, in spite of all difficulties, the lovers are united at the end of the piece.

§ 6. It is extremely doubtful whether the name of LONGUS, which is given to the author of the pastoral romance of 'Daphnis and Chloe' (ποιμενικὰ τὰ κατὰ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλοήν), was ever the designation of any Greek author.² It has been supposed that, as the Florentine manuscript describes the tale as *Λασβιακῶν ἐρωτικῶν λόγοι* δ', the alleged name of the author is simply a false reading of the last word of this title.³ If the author was really called Longus, he was probably a freedman of one of the many Roman families who bore this cognomen; and, to say nothing of the grammarian Velius Longus, it was found

¹ As a specimen of the machinery by which the details of the plot are worked out, it may be sufficient to cite the incident by which Cleitophon is convinced of the death of Leucippe (lib. V. c. 7). The pirates had carried her off from Alexandria, and her lover was pursuing in another vessel. When the pirates saw that they were pressed, they beheaded a female in sight of their pursuers, and threw her body into the sea, exclaiming, 'here is your prize' (ἰδοὺ τὸ ἄθλον ὑμῶν). This, and the appearance of a ship which comes to the aid of the pirates, is sufficient to stop the pursuit of Cleitophon, and he does not see Leucippe again until he goes to Ephesus as the husband of Melitte, and finds her there as a slave on Thersander's estate.

² The best account of 'the Pastoral Romance of Longus' is to be found in Knight's *Quarterly Magazine*, vol. I. pp. 277—295. The initials at the end of the article show that it is by the same eminent scholar who contributed the paper on 'the later ages of heathen philosophy' to the second volume of the same miscellany—namely, Professor Malden. He has treated the subject with the learning of a philologist and the genius of a poet.

³ This is suggested by Schöll, *Hist. de la Litt. Gr.* VI. p. 238, and the suggestion is adopted by Jacobs in his German version, and by Seiler in his edition of *Longi Pastoralia*, Lipsiæ, 1835. The last writer says (*Præf.* p. III., note) that the best MS. begins and ends with *λόγου ποιμενικῶν* instead of *Δόγγου*, and that Stephens cites two copies, in one of which the heading was *λόγου*, in the other *Δόγγου*.

in the families of the Sulpicii, Duilii, Sempronii, and Porcii ; and a L. Manlius Vulso Longus was consul in A.U.C. 256. Be this as it may, we know nothing of the author's life or date. The book itself shows that he was a clever and well-read sophist of the school of Lucian and the Philostrati ; and the style and tone of the novel, no less than its proper title *Λεσβιακά*, or 'Lesbian adventures,' place it in the same class with the *Æthiopica* of Heliodorus.

In the introduction, the writer gives the following account of the occasion of his story : 'As I was hunting in Lesbos, in a grove of the nymphs I saw a sight—the most beautiful of all that I saw—the representation of a picture—a story of love. Beautiful was also the grove, thickly planted, blooming with flowers, and well watered ; one fountain nourished all, both the flowers and the trees. But the picture was still more charming, exhibiting both extraordinary and wonderful love adventures : so that many foreigners came on the report of it, both to make their supplications to the nymphs, and to see the painting.' After describing some of the incidents, he says : 'Having noticed many other circumstances, all relating to love, a desire seized me to write a book corresponding to the picture (*ἀντιγράψαι τῇ γραφῇ*). And when I had sought out for myself an interpreter of the painting, I elaborated four books, as an offering, on the one hand, to Love, and the Nymphs, and Pan ; and, on the other hand, as a possession (*κτῆμα*, in imitation of Thucydides), full of entertainment for all men, which will heal him who is love-sick, cheer him that is moody, remind him who has loved, and teach him that has not loved. For, assuredly, no one has escaped love, or will escape it so long as beauty is and eyes see. To us may the gods grant to be temperate ourselves, and to write the loves of others.' The plot is very simple. A goatherd at Mitylene finds a beautiful boy, and two years after a shepherd finds a fair female infant. These two foundlings, who are called Daphnis and Chloe, tend the goats and sheep respectively of their preservers, and fall into most unsophisticated love with one another. The greater part of the story is taken up with their childish efforts to understand and realize the passion which inspires them. After sundry adventures, the proprietor of the soil makes his appearance, and it

turns out that Daphnis is his son : and at a feast given by the father, one of the guests, another rich man, discovers that Chloe is his daughter. The pastoral lovers are married, and in their more luxurious life which follows, they do not forget the rustic simplicity of their youthful days ; they worship the Nymphs, and Pan, and Love ; they call their son and daughter Philopœmen and Agele ; and make the boy suck a she-goat, as Daphnis had done ; while the girl, like Chloe, is placed under the nursing care of an ewe. And the grotto, which suggested the story to Longus, was of course adorned by the happy pair with the pictorial representations of their early life and adventures.

The whole tone and subject matter of this romance show that its author had diligently studied the erotic, elegiac, and bucolic poetry of the Alexandrian age. That it was, in fact, only a poem in rhetorical form is indicated by the beautiful little allegory, which the author puts into the mouth of Philetas, even showing by the name the poetical imitation which he intended.¹ In spite of its many grave blemishes, it is impossible to read the *Lesbiaca* of Longus without feeling some admiration for the genius of the author. It produces an effect not unlike that of the best pieces of Theocritus. There cannot indeed be a better testimony to its literary merits, than that which is furnished by the fact that it has given birth to a long series of direct imitations. It has been the model of the *Sireine* of D'Urfé, of the *Diana* of Montemayor, of the *Aminta* of Tasso, of the *Pastor Fido* of Guarini, and of the *Gentle Shepherd* of Allan Ramsay, — French, Italian, and English translations having made it a familiar book of entertainment since the middle of the sixteenth century. It is also generally agreed that the *Paul et Virginie* of Saint Pierre is a refined and passionate reproduction of *Daphnis and Chloe*, with special reference of course to the half concealed object of the book, to represent plebeian nature at war with aristocratic convention, an object which gave the French romance so much importance at the time of its first appearance in 1788. We regret to add that the pastoral of Longus has many points

¹ This allegory is elegantly rendered in Spenserian verse in the paper to which we have referred : Knight's *Qu. Mag.* I. p. 292.

in common with the vile book of Louvet, which appeared at the same time as *Paul et Virginie*, and to which the historian of the French Revolution assigns a parallel importance.¹

§ 7. Whatever doubt there may be as to the personal identity of Longus, there is no doubt at all that CHARITON, of *Aphrodisias*, is the feigned name² of the erotic novelist, to whom we owe the romance of Chæreas and Callirrhoe. He pretends to have been the secretary of Athenagoras, who is mentioned by Thucydides³ as a Syracusan orator, the opponent of Hermocrates; and the daughter of the latter is the heroine of the piece. The romance is less known by its merits than by the very elaborate commentary, of which D'Orville made it the vehicle and excuse.⁴ The age of the author is not ascertained, but it seems to us, from internal evidence, that it belongs to the same school as the romance of Achilles Tatius, and was perhaps suggested by it. We have a revival in the tomb, with happier results than that of Juliet, and the usual intervention of robbers.

To the same class we refer the frigid romance of 'the adventures of Hysmine and Hysminia' (τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δράμα), attributed to a writer differently named EMATHIUS, EUMATHIUS, or EUSTATHIUS (the first being the most probable),⁵ and described as either a Macrembolite (Μακρεμβολίτης), which would make him Byzantine, or a Parembolite (Παρεμβολίτης), which would make him an Egyptian, from the city Paremboli near Cyrene. He calls himself a man of the highest rank (πρωτονωβελίσσιμος, *protonobilissimus*), and chief keeper of the archives (μέγας χαρτοφύλαξ), which sound like Byzantine titles. The age of the romance has been fixed as late as the twelfth century.⁶

¹ Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution*, vol. I. pp. 84, 85.

² There was a town called *Aphrodisias* in Caria, but it is obvious that the writer merely announces himself as one who combined the Graces with the Goddess of love.

³ VI. 35, 36.

⁴ D'Orville's edition of Chariton was published at Amsterdam in 1750, in three volumes 4to. F. A. Wolf calls the commentary 'a corn-bin of erudition' (ein Futterkasten von Gelehrsamkeit) (*Vorlesungen*, II. p. 324).

⁵ All that can be said about this author is collected by P. Le Bas, *Aventures de Hysmine et Hysminia par Eumathe Macrembolite, traduites du Grec*, Paris, 1828, and by F. Osann, *Prolegomena ad Eustathii Macrembolite de amoribus Hysminie et Hysmines drama ab se edendum*, Gissæ, 1855.

⁶ F. A. Wolf, regards him as belonging to the middle ages: *Vorlesungen*, II. p. 324.

We should be disposed to place it in the sixth. But, in any case, it is the most recent, as it is the least interesting of these romances. The story is tedious to the utmost degree, and the style is not only both affected and careless, but deformed by the most wearisome tautology. It has been remarked that the adjective ὅλος occurs in almost every other period.¹

It is uncertain to what age we must refer the romance entitled the 'history of Apollonius king of Tyre,' which Godfrey of Viterbo, towards the end of the thirteenth century, inserted in his Pantheon or Universal Chronicle; but it bears internal marks of a Greek original,² and probably belonged to the fictions of the Byzantine age. A Christian named Symposius has been supposed to have been the author.³ It has a peculiar interest for Englishmen, for it is introduced by Gower in his *Confessio Amantis*, and has furnished Shakspeare with the materials for one of the earliest of his plays—'Pericles or Pyrocles prince of Tyre.'⁴

§ 8. Besides their favorite practice of forging letters attributed to eminent men, the Greek sophists indulged in the more harmless amusement of inditing letters professedly fictitious, and intended only to serve the same purpose as a romance. The two best known of these epistolographers are ALCIPHRON and ARISTÆNETUS.

It cannot be proved, with regard to either of these writers, that we have his genuine name. It is quite possible that it was a part of the fiction to assume the name of a sophist, as well as those of the supposed correspondents. Aristænetus makes Alciphron a correspondent of Lucian. It is therefore probable that there was a well-known sophist of that name in

¹ This is Casaubon's character of the book (*Casauboniana*, p. 13): 'est sane ejusmodi, quem legisse me non pœniteat, non legisse haud magni faciam. Inventiones frigidiusculæ; narrationes fere ὁμοειδεῖς καὶ πιθανὸν οὐκ ἔχουσαι. Dictio negligens sæpe interdum affectata putidiuscule. Verbis quibusdam et phrasibus ad satietatem scriptor iste utitur. Vix aliquot periodos reperias sine nomine ὅλος.'

² See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VI. p. 821, (lib. V. c. 6 *ad fin.*); Tyrwhitt's note in his introductory discourse to the *Canterbury Tales*, p. 126, Pickering's edition; and Lapaume's *Prefatiuncula* to his new edition of the *Erotica de Apollonio Tyrio Fabula*, Paris, 1856.

³ Barth, *Advers.* LVIII. 1.

⁴ The Greek name, *Desdemona* (Δυσδαίμωνα) shows that *Othello* also came from a Greek original: see *New Cratylus*, § 180.

the second century. But it does not follow that the same sophist wrote the letters attributed to him. Again, there was an eminent sophist called Aristænetus, who lost his life when Nicomedia was destroyed by the earthquake in A.D. 358, and whom Libanius praises. But the epistolographer does not justify the encomium, and he could not have been a contemporary of Libanius, for he refers to the pantomimist Caramallus,¹ a contemporary of Sidonius Apollinaris,² who died in A.D. 484. If, then, the sophist, who wrote the letters bearing the name of Aristænetus, assumed that name, and lived a century at least after the person whose person he represented, he may have committed a similar anachronism with regard to the epistolary sophist whom he imitated, or that sophist himself may have taken the name of an older Alciphron. Whatever conclusion we may come to respecting the authorship of these collections of fictitious letters, there can be no doubt that they belong to the same class as the erotic romances. They are, in fact, to the stories of Heliodorus and his followers what the *Heroidum Epistolæ* of Ovid are to the narrative love-poems of the Alexandrian school.

The letters of Alciphron are about 100 in number, and they are divided into three books. They represent classes of the older Greek community, and are valuable from the glimpses which they give of social life, the materials being mostly derived from the remains of the middle and new comedy. The most lively are those supposed to be written by celebrated Hetæræ, especially those from Glycera to Menander. The style is a careful imitation of the best Attic.

The erotic epistles of Aristænetus are divided into two books, the first containing twenty-eight and the second twenty-two letters. There is but little skill in the personification. In fact, the epistles have merely the form of such communications, being really narratives and descriptions, sometimes humorous and sometimes sentimental, put into the framework of a correspondence. No sensible change would be made in any one of them if this formal machinery were removed. The language is often a mere cento of phrases taken from Plato, Lucian, Plu-

¹ Aristænetus, I. 26.

² Sidon. Apoll. *Carm.* XXIII. 267.

tarch, Philostratus, Alciphron, and even Xenophon the Ephesian, and the whole work produces the effect of a series of schoolboy exercises.

§ 9. While some of the sophists were amusing themselves and their readers by clothing in facile and rhetorical prose the erotic and bucolic subjects which a purer age had thought better adapted to poetry, an Egyptian boldly revived the mythographic epos, which had been cultivated at Alexandria in the earliest days of the Museum. This was NONNUS,¹ of Panopolis, who is considered as the founder of a school, the last which entered methodically on the old field of heathen Greek poetry. He is mentioned by Agathias, who flourished in the second half of the sixth century, as one of the recent poets (νέοι),² and there is no particular reason to doubt the correctness of the supposition that he was the Nonnus whose son Sosena is recommended as a well educated young man³ in one of the letters of Synesius. If so he flourished at the commencement of the fifth century. Besides the heathen epic, which we are about to consider, he has left us a metrical paraphrase of St. John's Gospel.⁴ And the only way of accounting for such inconsistent productions of the same pen is to suppose that, like Achilles Tatius, he was not converted till his latter days, and that the metrical gospel was an effort of his old age.

The epic poem, which, in accordance with the terminology of the age, is called 'Dionysian adventures' (Διονυσιακά or

¹ M. le comte de Marcellus, the enthusiastic editor and translator of this poet, insists on his being called *Nonnus*, not *Nonnos* (*les Dionysiaques ou Bacchus, Grec et Français*, Paris, 1856, p. IV.). This does not appear to us a question of much importance. It is of more consequence to know that the term signified 'a saint, or spiritual superior.' 'Priores juniores suos fratres nomen; juniores autem priores suos nonnos vocent, quod intelligitur paterna reverentia' (Reg. Sti Benedicti, *apud Marcellum*, p. VIII.). Hence we should conclude in favour of the Christianity of the poet of Panopolis.

² IV. 128: καὶ οἱ νέοι παραλαβόντες συνάδουσιν· ὦν δὴ καὶ Νόννος ὁ ἐκ τῆς Πανὸς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας γεγεννημένος ἐν τινὶ τῶν οἰκείων ποιημάτων, ἅπερ αὐτῷ Διονυσιακά ἐπωνόμασται. Marcellus (p. IX.) translates οἰκείων ποιημάτων, 'compositions patriotiques.' But this seems to be a mistake. Agathias must mean 'poems peculiar to himself,' i.e. either in subject or metrical structure.

³ *Epist.* 102: διὰ λόγων τραφέντα καὶ αὐξηθέντα. Cf. *Ep.* 43.

⁴ This Μεταβολὴ τοῦ κατ' Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίου was, owing to its subject, often republished and much studied in the first centuries after the revival of literature.

Βασσαρικά), is an enormous farrago of learning¹ on the well-worked subject of Bacchus, with which the author has connected a good deal of miscellaneous mythology. Thus the first six of the forty eight books, into which it is divided, are occupied with the rape of Europa, the battle with the giants, the mythic history of Thebes, and other legends; and the birth of Bacchus is not given till the seventh book.² The main subject is one which would interest an Egyptian from the parallelisms of Bacchus and Osiris; it had furnished abundant materials to the older Greek poets; and since the time of Alexander it had become usual to connect the history of the god with that of the great eastern conqueror. In one sense it may certainly be admitted that Nonnus makes the most of it. His great merit, however, is the systematic perfection to which he brought the Homeric hexameter. He had the good judgment to recognize the impossibility of writing modern Greek according to the rules of the Homeric metre, and he introduced some changes which made the hexameter at once more regular and more harmonious. The metrical innovations of Nonnus have been thus described by a modern scholar.³ He increased the number of dactyls in the verse; instead of a penthemimeral cæsure he introduced a trochaic cæsure in the

¹ It has been supposed that Nonnus derived some of his materials from Indian sources, and in the earlier days of European Sanscritism, Wilford and Sir W. Jones did not hesitate to seek a direct parallelism between the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus, and the *Mahabhârata* or *Râmâyana*. But not to speak of the improbability of the hypothesis that an Egyptian of the sixth century made himself acquainted with Indian poetry, there is not a sufficient resemblance between his conceptions and those of the Brahmins to justify the belief that he borrowed from any such sources. See Marcellus, *Introduction*, pp. L., LI. The Indian names introduced in the twenty-sixth book show very few traces of a direct derivation from native sources.

² Marcellus, however, maintains that Nonnus is eminently systematic: 'il a une methode exacte, un plan bien conçu, tracé sans confusion, suivi sans désordre,' *Introduction*, p. LII.

³ Hermann, *post Orphica*, pp. 690 sqq.: 'Nonnus seu quisquis alius melioris disciplinæ auctor fuit, spondeorum pondus cum dactylorum volubilitate commutavit, cæsuram introduxit trochaicam in tertio pede, trochæum ex quarto pede expulit, Atticis correptionibus liberavit hexametrum, apostrophum quantum potuit removit, hiatus non nisi in Homericis verborum formulis, atque in his quoque rarissime admisit, productiones denique brevium syllabarum in cæsure plane ejecit. Ita etsi gravitatem antiquam amisit versus heroicus, numeros tamen recuperavit et rotundos et elegantes, tamque severam accepit disciplinam, ut nisi peritus non posset epos moliri.'

third foot; he allowed no trochaic cæsura in the fourth place; he did not make a vowel short before a mute and a liquid; he avoided elisions as far as possible; except in Homeric phrases he did not permit the hiatus, and very rarely admitted it even in these; and altogether rejected the licence of making a short syllable long when the cæsura fell upon it. In this way he introduced greater artificial regularity and exactness into the heroic verse, and at the same time increased its applicability to the modern forms of the language. And from the impulse which he gave to this branch of versification, he may be considered as the founder of the school, though, from the very nature of the case, it was not likely to be of long duration, or to produce very important effects on the taste and culture of the age.

§ 10. QUINTUS SMYRNÆUS, used to be called *Quintus Calaber*, merely because Cardinal Bessarion found the first manuscript of his poem in the monastery of St. Nicolas at Otranto in the ancient Calabria. That he was a native of Smyrna we know from himself. For he tells us, in his poem,¹ that ‘the Muses had inspired him with poetry before the dawn was spread over his cheeks, as he fed the bleating sheep in the fields of Smyrna, thrice as far from the Hermus as a man’s shout can be heard, near the temple of Diana, in a noble park, and on an upland neither very level nor very lofty.’ His age is not known, but he is obviously an imitator of the metre of Nonnus, and probably flourished in the fifth century. He has not taken so wide a range as Nonnus, but has drawn up from the best authorities a continuation of Homer’s *Iliad* down to the capture of Troy and the departure of the Greeks. The following are the subjects of the fourteen books into which this ‘Sequel to Homer’ (τὰ μεθ’ Ὀμηρον), or ‘Supplement to Homer’ (παραλειπόμενα Ὀμήρου), is divided: (I.) Penthesilea comes to the

¹ *Posthomer.* XII. 308—313:

ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ’ ἀοιδήν,
πρὶν μοι ἀμφὶ παρῆα κατασκίδνασθαι βούλον,
Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι,
τρὶς τόσον Ἑρμου ἄπωθεν ὅσον βοοῶντος ἀκοῦσαι,
Ἄρτέμιδος περὶ νηὸν ἐλευθερίῳ ἐνὶ κήπῳ,
οὐρεῖ τ’ οὐτε λίην χθαμαλῶ οὐθ’ ὑψόθι πολλῶ.

succour of the Trojans and is slain by Achilles; (II.) Memnon also appears to rescue them, and meets with the same fate; (III.) Achilles, pursuing the Trojans to their walls, is shot by Apollo, whom he had challenged to combat, and his body and arms are not recovered without a great struggle; (IV.) the funeral of Achilles is celebrated with games; (V.) his arms are adjudged to Ulysses; Ajax goes mad and kills himself; (VI.) Diomedes and Ulysses are sent to secure the aid of Neoptolemus; meanwhile Eurypylus, the nephew of Priam, comes to his assistance with an army of Mysians and defeats the Greeks; (VII.) Neoptolemus arrives; (VIII.) he has a field-day to himself and slays Eurypylus; (IX.) Philoctetes is brought to the camp; (X.) Paris is slain by Philoctetes; (XI.) the battle continues, and the Greeks endeavour in vain to storm Troy; (XII.) Calchas recommends them to construct the wooden horse; after a battle among the gods, in the absence of Jupiter, the event takes place as described by Virgil, except that Sinon is mutilated by the Trojans before he tells his tale; (XIII.) Troy is taken and burnt to the ground; (XIV.) Polyxena is sacrificed in obedience to a vision of Achilles, and the Greeks sail homeward, but are overtaken by a storm, and the fate of Ajax, the son of Oileus, is elaborately described.

In this painstaking work Quintus has earned the praise of careful versification, and of a certain amount of ingenuity in his similes. But he has no epic genius; he cannot paint characters; and his gods and heroes are only so many puppets, which he sets in motion by very visible strings. Pathos is quite beyond his reach. And when he aims at it with the strongest effort, he almost becomes ludicrous. Thus, when C  none, after refusing to heal the wound of Paris, performs upon herself the sacrifice of the Sutt  e out of regret for his death, a sagacious nymph standing by indulges in the reflexion that Paris must have been a madman to neglect such a faithful wife for a worthless dame like Helen.¹

§ 11. Nonnus found in his own country two very diligent

¹ X. 471:

*  τρεκ  ς Πα  ρις   εν   τ  σθαλος,   ς μ  λα κεδν  ν
  λλιπε κουριδ  ην κα   αν  γαγε μαργ  ν   κοιτιν.
  ς   ρ'   φη Ν  μφη τις αν   φ  νας κ.τ.λ.*

cultivators of his reformed hexameter on Homeric subjects, COLUTHUS of Lycopolis, in the Thebais, who is stated to have flourished in the time of the emperor Anastasius I. (A.D. 491-518),¹ and TRYPHIODORUS, who is generally described as an Egyptian. The age of the latter is not given, but he is mentioned by one of the later rhetoricians² along with Musæus, who is referred to the end of the fifth century; and his poem on the taking of Troy indicates the same style and age as the *Posthomericæ* of Quintus.

Of the works said to have been written by Coluthus,³—‘Calydonian adventures’ (Καλυδωνιακά), in six books; ‘Persian stories’ (Περσικά); and ‘encomia in epic verse’ (ἐγκώμια)—we have no remains; and the little poem which has come down to us in 392 hexameters, on ‘the abduction of Helen’ (Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή), is not mentioned. It is quite possible that it may be an extract from one of these lost books, for the forty-two books of Nonnus tell us that the title of a mythographic epos was by no means exclusive. The few lines which have come down to us begin with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis,⁴ the apple of discord,⁵ the rivalry of the three goddesses,⁶ and so on, till Paris and Helen abscond, and leave Hermione,⁷ rather than Menelaus, to express the feelings of the widowed home. The author’s want of taste often renders him ludicrous when he means to be peculiarly impressive, and his ignorance is quite surprising. He makes Paris arrive by sea at Sparta, after having seen, as he sailed along, ‘the cities of the Achæan land, Phthia the nurse of men, and the wide-streeted Mycenæ!’⁸ The gay Lothario lands, takes a bath,⁹ and walks to Sparta with mincing steps, lest he should soil his feet, and slowly, lest the wind should disturb his hair!¹⁰ The

¹ Suidas, s.v.: Κόλουθος (v. Κόλλουθος), Λυκοπολίτης Θηβαίος ἐποποιὺς γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων βασιλείως Ἀναστασίου.

² Anonym. περὶ τοῦ τελείου λόγου; Walz, *Rhet.* III. p. 574; Bekker, *Anecd.* p. 1082.

³ Suid. u.s.

⁴ vv. 17 sqq.

⁵ vv. 44 sqq.

⁶ vv. 64 sqq.

⁷ vv. 326 sqq.

⁸ v. 220.

⁹ v. 230.

¹⁰ vv. 231—234:

ᾤχετο φειδομένοισιν ἐπ’ ἔχνεσιν ἔχνος ἐρείδων
μὴ πόδες ἡμεροέντες ὑποχραίνοντο κοιλίης,
μὴ πλοκάμων κυνέηφιν ἐπιβρίσαντες ἐθείρας
ὀξύτερον σπεύδοντας ἀναστέλλοιεν ἄηται.

faithless wife of Menelaus yields on the first statement of his errand in a speech of only twenty-five lines! In fact, the fragment has nothing to recommend it, except its harmonious versification according to the principles of Nonnus.

Tryphiodorus, who was a grammarian by profession, is said to have written¹—besides the fragment on ‘the taking of Troy’ (*ἄλωσις Τροίας*), which has come down to us in 691 verses—‘Marathonian adventures’ (*Μαραθωνιακά*); ‘the story of Hippodamia’ (*τὰ καθ’ Ἱπποδάμειαν*); and an ‘Odyssey with omitted letters’ (*Ὀδύσσεια λειπογράμματος*)—that is, a poetical account of the adventures of Ulysses, in twenty-four books, numbered according to the letters of the alphabet, but so composed that in book *a*’ the letter *a* did not occur, and so on. A certain Nestor, in the reign of Septimius Severus, had written an ‘Iliad with omitted letters;’ and no doubt Tryphiodorus thought this a worthy object of imitation.² The principal feature in the little poem, which has come down to us, and which is expressly described by the author as a separate poem briefly and hastily written,³ is to describe the adventure of the wooden horse. We have a very elaborate picture of the horse itself, as a work of art.⁴ The poet dwells on its golden mane its eyes of beryl and amethyst; its open mouth champing the bit with white teeth, and really serving, with the nostrils, as an air-passage for the garrison;⁵ its tortoiseshell hoofs and splendid trappings. The Greeks within are furnished by Minerva with a good supper of ambrosia.⁶ When the treacherous machine is placed within the temple of Minerva, which is of course miraculously expanded to receive it, Helen is brought there by Venus, who, in the shape of a Trojan duenna, tells her that Menelaus is concealed within the horse.⁷ She walks round,

¹ Suidas, s.v. Τρυφίδωρος.

² Suidas, s.v. Νέστωρ Λαρανδεύς, ἐκ Λυκίας, ἐποποιός, πατήρ Πείσανδρου τοῦ ποιητοῦ, γεγονώς ἐπὶ Σεβήρου τοῦ βασιλέως. Ἰλιάδα [γράφας] λειπογράμματος ἦτοι ἀστοιχείωτον. ὁμοίως δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Τρυφίδωρος ἔγραψεν Ὀδύσσειαν. ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μὴ εὐρίσκεσθαι ἀ, καὶ κατὰ ῥαψωδίαν οὕτως τὸ ἐκάστης ἐκλιμπάνει στοιχείον.

³ v. 3—5:

αὐτίκα μοι σπεύδοντι πολὺν διὰ μῦθον ἀνεῖσα
ἔννεπε Καλλιόπεια· καὶ ἀρχαίην ξριν ἀνδρῶν
κεκριμένου πολέμοιο ταχείῃ λύσων ἀοιδῇ.

⁴ vv. 57, 102.

⁵ vv. 75, 76.

⁶ vv. 185.

⁷ vv. 454 sqq.

reminding the Greeks within of their absent wives. The other heroes weep in silence, but Antiohus is so much excited by the mention of Laodameia that he is about to reply, when Ulysses strangles him then and there, and he is buried in the thigh of the wooden monster.¹ Helen is driven from the temple by the angry reproaches of Minerva, and, from seeking to betray them, suddenly becomes their accomplice.² And Troy is taken and destroyed in the usual manner. From this specimen, which includes all that is most lively in the poem, the reader will see that we have not much reason to deplore the loss of the other works of Tryphiodorus. From his statement that the children of the Trojans unwittingly atoned for the sins of their fathers,³ it has been surmised that he was a Christian, but this is a very slender proof of his faith.

§ 12. The most interesting, perhaps, of these epic productions of the school of Nonnus is 'the story of Hero and Leander' (τὰ καθ' Ἡρώ καὶ Λέανδρον), in 340 verses, which bear the name of MUSÆUS. For grace of diction, metrical elegance, and simple pathos, which avoids all violations of good taste, this little canto stands far before the other poems of the same age. We know nothing of the history of this Musæus,⁴ but his imitations of the style of Nonnus⁵ show that he was later than the poet of Panopolis. He is indirectly referred to by Agathias,⁶ who flourished in the first half of the sixth century. Achilles Tatius, whose date is only approximately fixed, has a passage,

¹ v. 485 :

κοῖλον ὑποκρύψαντες ἐς ἴσχιον ἐνθεσαν ἱππου.

² v. 512.

³ v. 603 :

πολλὰ δὲ νήπια τέκνα μινυμβαδίων ἀπὸ μαζῶν [? μαστῶν]
μητέρος ἡρπάζοντο, καὶ οὐ νοέοντα τοκῇν
ἀμπλακίας ἀπέτινον.

⁴ Bernhardt, *Grundriss*, II. p. 263 : 'the *vita* in *Cod. Matrit.* 24, Iriarte, p. 86,—where the article Μουσαῖος Ἐλευσίνιος in Suidas has the conclusion : καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τὸ περὶ Ἡρώ καὶ Λεάνδρου πεπίστευται εἶτ' ἄλλου. διάφοροι γὰρ Μουσαῖοι ἐγένοντο,—belongs to Constantine Lascaris.'

⁵ Hermann, *Orph.* p. 690 ; cf. Musæus, v. 36, with Nonnus, *Dionys.* XVI. 392.

⁶ Niebuhr has noticed that Agathias V. 22, *ad fin.* is borrowed from Musæus, v. 327, and the remark of Agathias V. 11 : Σηστός γε ἐστὶ πόλις ἡ περιάλητος τῇ ποιήσει καὶ ὀνομαστοτάτῃ κ.τ.λ. seems to be a general allusion to the story of Hero and Leander.

either borrowed from Musæus, or conversely adopted from the prose writer by the poet, or derived by both of them from some common source.¹ And the same uncertainty belongs to the correspondence between him and Coluthus. Perhaps the most definite trace of his personal identity is the letter addressed by Procopius of Gaza, who flourished in the first half of the sixth century, to a grammarian named Musæus; for in all the manuscripts of the poem the author is called a grammarian.² From these considerations, it seems a fair inference that Musæus flourished at the end of the fifth and at the beginning of the sixth century.

The poem of 'Hero and Leander' belongs rather to erotic than to epic poetry. Its subject is the well-known story of Hero, the beautiful priestess of Venus at Sestos, and Leander, who was the glory of Abydos on the other side of the water, and who swam across the Hellespont every evening to his fair bride, till at last he was drowned on a winter's night, and his body cast up at the foot of Hero's tower, who, in despair, cast herself down from the battlements, and died by the side of her lover. This tragedy of Hero and Leander, the Juliet and Romeo of the Dardanelles, was of much older date than Musæus. It was well known to Ovid,³ Virgil,⁴ and Statius,⁵ and had become a popular love-tale. But Musæus is the author of the most complete version of the story, and he has told it in a manner which will bear criticism.⁶ There is no pause in the

¹ Cf. Musæus, vv. 92—98 :

κάλλος γὰρ περίπυστον ἀμωμήτοιο γυναικὸς
 δξύτερον μερόπεσσι πέλει πτερόεντος δίστοῦ·
 ὀφθαλμὸς δ' ὁδὸς ἐστίν. ἀπ' ὀφθαλμοῖο βολάων
 ἔλκος ὀλισθαίνει καὶ ἐπὶ φρένας ἀνδρὸς ὀδεύει·
 εἴλε δέ μιν τότε θάμβος, ἀναιδέλη, τρόμος, αἰδῶς—

with Achill. Tatius, I. 4 : κάλλος γὰρ δξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους, καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέει, ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῶ τραύματι. πάντα δέ μ' εἶχεν ὁμοῦ ἔπαινος, ἐκπληξίς, κ.τ.λ.

² See Passow in his edition and translation of Musæus (Leipsig, 1810), p. 97.

³ *Heroid.* XVIII.

⁴ *Georg.* III. 258 sqq.

⁵ *Theb.* VI. 535, 6 :

Phryxei natat hic contemptor Ephebus
 Æquoris, et picta translucet cæruluss unda.

⁶ There is a lively essay on the poem by a good English scholar in *Fraser's Magazine* for April, 1846, pp. 437 sqq.

brief narrative from the beginning, where the lovers meet, like the hero and heroine of Heliodorus and Shakspeare, on a festive occasion,¹ down to the fatal issue of Hero's passion. The poet does not, like the other erotic writers, delight in his opportunity of describing details. There is nothing to shock the most delicate reader, and the grace of the language is sometimes enhanced by a conciseness of expression² which would have done credit to a better age. The 'Hero and Leander' of Musæus is the dying swan-note of Greek poetry, the last distinct echo of the old music of Hellas.

¹ vv. 42 sqq.

² As, for example, where Hero is called (v. 287): Πάρθενος ἡματιή, νυχίη γυνή.

CHAPTER LX.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CULTIVATION OF LITERATURE AT
BYZANTIUM.

- § 1. Historical Sketch of Byzantine literature, from Justinian to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks. § 2. Classification of the literary productions of this period. § 3. Learned collectors. § 4. Lexicographers. § 5. Grammarians and commentators. § 6. Sophists. § 7. Poets. § 8. First class of Byzantine historians, or writers of Byzantine annals. § 9. Second class, or chroniclers. § 10. Third class, or biographers. § 11. Fourth class, or antiquarians. § 12. Ecclesiastical historians. § 13. Physiologists and physicians. § 14. General retrospect of Greek literature.

§ 1. **A**T the commencement of the last chapter we indicated briefly the successive steps in the downward course of Greek literature at Byzantium. We must here examine, with somewhat more of detail, the long period of decadence which intervened between the accession of Justinian the first in A.D. 527 and the taking of Constantinople in A.D. 1453. As far as literature is concerned, this period may be subdivided, as we hinted in the last chapter, by taking, as the commencements of fresh epochs, the accession of the Macedonian house in A.D. 867; that of the Commeni in 1081; and that of the Palæologi in 1261; for at each of these æras a fresh stimulus was given to the cultivation of letters, and a new, but rather spasmodic, life was infused into the decrepit and moribund senility of Greek genius. We shall thus have four main subdivisions in the history of Byzantine literature properly so called: I. from 527 to 867; II. from 867 to 1081; III. from 1081 to 1261; IV. from 1261 to 1453.

I. The dubious glories of the reign of Justinian were followed by a period of corruption, tyranny, and oriental barbarism, which reached its darkest night in the contests between the image-worshippers (*iconoduli*), and image-breakers (*iconoclastæ*). Such a state of things could furnish no *pabulum* for anything

like a national literature at Byzantium itself, and the events, which were going on in the world, greatly diminished the area over which the Greek language was still spread as the vernacular means of communication. In the time of Justinian the geographical limits of the Greek language and literature included, besides Asia Minor, Syria, and Armenia towards the east and south, Egypt, with the adjoining regions of Libya, as far south as Abyssinia, and as far west as the Syrtes; in Europe, they extended over Sicily and southern Italy; and some fragments of Greek learning found their way as far as Gaul and Britain. The conquests of the Arabians in the seventh century caused the first diminution of this linguistic empire. Syria and Egypt were brought under the sway of the crescent in A.D. 633—638, and though there is no reason to believe the story that Omar burned the great library, which he is said to have found at Alexandria, but which was partly destroyed in the time of Julius Cæsar, it is certain that JOANNES PHILOPONUS, who flourished in the seventh century, and was in Egypt when the Arabians conquered the country, was the last who cultivated Greek literature at Alexandria. In Syria the native Aramaic took the place of the Greek, and the Syrians interpreted between their old and new masters.¹ The influence of the Arabians extended along the north coast of Africa, and absorbed Sicily. To the north and west of Byzantium, Slavonian and Germanic tribes intruded on the Greek provinces nearer to the capital, and confined the vernacular Hellenic to a continually decreasing circle. In Constantinople itself there was not much literary activity. Whether the library and college of the Octagon, which existed in the eighth century, were instituted at this period cannot be ascertained. But some similar and perhaps better educational foundation was no doubt in existence, and the classical writers (ἐγκύκλιοι) were taught with a strange mixture of church fathers and later rhetoricians,—Libanius and Basil being placed on the same footing as Demosthenes, Plutarch, and Dion Cassius being preferred to Herodotus and Thucydides, the commentators on Hermogenes and Aphthonius being substituted for the rhetoric of Aristotle, and Plato and

¹ Bernhardt, *Grundriss*, I. p. 477.

Aristotle being seen darkly, if at all, through the clouded glasses of Proclus, Olympiodorus, and Joannes Philoponus. The poetry of the age was represented by *GEORGE the Pisidian*, *AGATHIAS* and *PAUL the Silentiary*. *PROCOPIUS*, the same *AGATHIAS*, *MENANDER the Protector*, *NONNOSUS*, *PETRUS MAGISTER*, *HESYCHIUS ILLUSTRIS*, *THEOPHYLACTUS SIMOCATTA*, and *THEOPHANES* wrote memoirs and histories; *JOANNES LAURENTIUS the Lydian* occupied himself with Roman antiquities; and *ÆTIUS*, *ALEXANDER of Tralles*, *PAUL of Ægina*, and *THEOPHILUS PROTOSPATHARIUS* indited medical commentaries. Then came the age of 'the image-breakers' (717—867), when it is said that *Leo the Isaurian*, not content with the general discouragement of literature, burned the library of the Octagon and abolished that college. Learning suffered even more from the zeal of his immediate successor, *Constantine Copronymus*, and there was no improvement until towards the close of this period, when *THEODORUS STUDITES*, *LEO*, and *PHOTIUS*, aided and encouraged by the emperor *Theophilus* and by *Bardas*, the uncle and colleague of *Michael III.*, reopened a sort of university at Constantinople, and prepared the way for a revival of literature. Under the Iconoclasts, *JOHN of Damascus* and *GEORGE the Syncellus*, or 'associate,' were the only writers of note, besides those men who form the transition to the next period.

II. The Augustan age of Byzantine literature is that during which the Macedonian dynasty occupied the throne. The first emperor of this house, *Basilus*, though himself a man of no education, had learned to value the advantages which his low birth had not allowed him to enjoy, and committed his son *Leo*, 'the philosopher,' to the learned instructions of *Photius*. The son of *Leo*, *CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS*, was not only a distinguished patron of learning, but contributed himself to the literature of his age. Indeed, he was rather a learned professor and bookmaker than the governor of a great empire. By the munificence of these princes,¹ 'the treasures of antiquity were deposited in the imperial library; by their pens, or those of their associates, they were imparted in such extracts and abridgments as might amuse the curiosity, without oppressing

¹ Gibbon, VII. p. 40.

the indolence, of the public. Besides the *Basilics*, or code of laws, the arts of husbandry and war, of feeding or destroying the human species, were propagated with equal diligence; and the history of Greece and Rome was digested into fifty-three heads or titles, of which two only (of embassies and of virtues and vices) have escaped the injuries of time. In every station the reader might contemplate the image of the past world, apply the lesson or warning of each page, and learn to admire, perhaps to imitate, the examples of a brighter period.' In accordance with this we find that the most valuable productions of these two centuries were republications of the works of ancient writers or extracts from them, and alphabetical glossaries calculated to illustrate them or the language in which they were written. Thus it gave us 'the library' of PHOTIUS, the dictionary of SUIDAS, and the work called the *Etymologicum Magnum*, the *Chronicum Paschale*, and those of JOANNES MALELAS, and LEO DIACONUS, the medical traditions of THEOPHANES NONNUS, the anthology of CONSTANTINE CEPHALAS, and the abridgment of Dion Cassius by XIPHILINUS of Trebizond. We have also from this period the historical works of GENESIUS and others, and the versified account of the expedition to Crete by THEODOSIUS DIACONUS.

III. The Commeni and their connexions of the house of Ducas brought to the patronage of literature the most favourable intentions, and some of them, especially ANNA COMMENA, showed literary talents of no ordinary kind. But the taste of the age was too corrupt, and even the feeling for the grammatical proprieties of the language was too dull to admit of any sensible amelioration even from the example and encouragement of the imperial house. Of the writers of this period the most celebrated in his own time was MICHAEL CONSTANTINE PSELLUS; the most useful to us were EUSTATHIUS of Thessalonica, and JOHN TZETZES; and we are indebted to GREGORIUS or GEORGIUS PARDUS, *Bishop of Corinth*, for a standard work on the Greek dialects. But whatever the Commeni had done for the literary culture of Constantinople was nullified when the Franks and Venetians stormed and took the city in 1204, and placed on the imperial throne a short-lived dynasty of ignorant warriors. Under these Latin Emperors, Greek letters found no toleration,

and had to seek for encouragement in the court of Nicæa, to which the Palæologi, now the representatives of the Commeni, had retired on the taking of the capital.

IV. When the Palæologi mounted the imperial throne they restored the outward forms of the old Greek empire, and, with these, endeavoured to revive the literary tastes of their ancestors. But the vital spark had long since fled from the body politic, and no imperial skill could reanimate a literature, which had lost for ever its intrinsic vitality.¹ It was in vain that Manuel VIII. and Andronicus II. combined the studies of the scholar with the pomp of the palace, or that John Cantacuzen devoted his declining years to literary leisure. It was to no purpose that GEORGE of CYPRUS endeavoured to bring into fashion the long disused Attic dialect, that BLEMMIDAS wrote on theology or PACHYMERES on history and philosophy, that THEODORUS HYRTACENUS adapted the poetry of Callimachus to the worship of the Virgin Mary, that the MOSCHOPULI composed treatises on grammar, that THOMAS MAGISTER and GEORGIUS LECAPENUS compiled lexicons of Attic words, and that DEMETRIUS TRICLINIUS drew up scholia on the tragedians. The Greeks themselves admitted that their literary fabric had no longer any life in it, as was shown pretty clearly when MAXIMUS PLANUDES began to translate Latin works into his own language. The dreadful Turk was at the gates of Constantinople. And the best of the native Greek scholars began to see that their occupation was gone in their own home, and that the reviving taste for Greek learning in Italy offered a new and more profitable field for their industry and talents. As early as the fourteenth century LEONTIUS PILATUS and MANUEL CHRYSOLORAS had been received in Italy as interpreters of their native literature, and the former had taught the great Florentine Boccaccio to understand and appreciate the original text of Homer.² Greek manuscripts were imported in increasing numbers, especially by Philéphus. In the fifteenth century, when the Turks were gathering around Constantinople, GEORGIUS GEMISTUS PLETHO,³

¹ See Hallam's *Literature of Europe*, I. pp. 130, 1.

² Hallam, *l.c.* I. p. 132.

³ A treatise by Pletho, *περὶ ἀρετῶν*, was published along with the tract *περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ κακιῶν*, by E. Fawconer, *Oxonii*, 1752. It has been stated to us that

and THEODORUS GAZA were established at Florence and Ferrara, GEORGE of *Trebizond* was a salaried teacher at Rome, JOHN BESSARION, also of Trebizond, was created a cardinal in 1439, and even after the fall of the imperial city, LAONICUS CHALCONDYLES¹ of Athens still wrote in Greek, JOHN LASCARIS spread the knowledge of his native language in the west, and MARCUS MUSURUS² assisted Aldus in his first printed editions of Greek books. But the time had come, when the traditionary learning of the Byzantine Greeks was called upon to surrender the monopoly of Hellenic scholarship, and when barbarians were destined to show that they were better prepared to criticize and explain the ancient authors, than those who professed to write and speak the ancient language of Plato and Demosthenes.³ Budæus in France, Reuchlin in Germany, and Erasmus in Holland, had no doubt derived some first lessons from the wandering exiles of Byzantium;⁴ but they brought to the study of the classical writers a sounder judgment, a more comprehensive criticism, and a more enthusiastic industry. The great French printers, who took the Greek name of Stephanus, perfected Greek lexicography in the sixteenth century; and a field was opened, which has been cultivated with increasing success, but almost ex-

this is a forgery, or at least a *jeu d'esprit*. We have no means of ascertaining how far this is the case.

¹ See below, § 8.

² Mr. Foster has printed the elegy which M. Musurus prefixed to the Aldine edition of Plato with a Latin version and notes (in his work on *Accent and Quantity*, pp. 403 sqq.): 'ut hoc Musuri exemplo cognosceretur, quales demum ii essent viri, quibus *Barbarorum* nomen ab eruditis quibusdam summa cum obtreptione atque vituperatione inustum est.'

³ Argyropulus, on hearing Reuchlin translate a passage from Thucydides, exclaimed, 'our banished Greece has now flown beyond the Alps.' Hallam, *l.c.* I. p. 289.

⁴ Budæus received some lessons both from Hermonymus and Lascaris, but does not speak in high terms of the benefits which he derived from their instructions (Hallam, I. p. 320). It is remarkable that, although many of the most eminent classical scholars have imitated the Latin of Cicero with distinguished success, Budæus is almost the only modern Hellenist who has attempted to use Greek prose for the expression of his own thoughts. His epistles are excellent specimens of Greek style, and his Commentaries show that he had paid much more attention to the prose writers, especially the orators, than to the poets. Scaliger says of him (*Scaligerana*, p. 38): 'il ne pouvoit rien écrire que *imitando*, ayant des lieux communs de phrases.' Why he occasionally translates his name *Guillaume* by *Ἰλερμος*, we cannot understand.

clusively by the scholars of Holland, Germany, and England. The etymology and syntax of the Greek language has been subjected to a scrutiny, which the older grammarians had never imagined. The paucity and corruption of the manuscripts has been in part remedied by the critical ingenuity of three generations of editors, and the various questions suggested by the subject-matter of the authors have been examined from every point of view, and have been answered with more or less distinctness and certainty.

§ 2. It does not belong to this work to give a list of all the Byzantine writers, still less to enumerate the works which appeared at Constantinople during the long period which we have just surveyed. It will be quite sufficient for our purpose if we mention such of the authors as are still most interesting to the modern scholar; and with this view it will be desirable to consider the decadence of Greek literature according to a classification which has less reference to the chronology of the works than to their bearing on the older productions of the classical age. Regarding Byzantine literature from this point of view, we shall assign the first place to those books which claim no originality, but have a higher value than their contemporaries, because they give extracts or fragments of the lost writings of the best days of Greece. The next place in value and importance belongs to the Lexicographers, who have preserved many additions to the vocabulary of the Greek language, and many forms of words, which would have been otherwise unknown to us, who have given us traditionary interpretations, in cases where the context is lost, who have explained many usages, legal and otherwise, of the ancient Greeks, and have recorded stray facts of literary and political biography, which we could not otherwise reproduce. In the third class, for a similar reason, we should place the grammarians and commentators, who have illustrated from sources no longer available the best of the classical authors. We may then pass on to the writers whose subjects are more likely to conduce to a certain originality on the part of the writers; but among these we shall place first the sophists and poets, who fall back for their style and mode of treatment on the older and better models; then we may consider the Byzantine historians, in the four subdivisions of continuous annalists, isolated chroniclers, biographers, and

antiquarians, into which they naturally fall; the ecclesiastical historians, whose subject is necessarily unclassical, will then follow; and the physiologists and physicians, who deal with questions of no particular age, will bring up the rear. A comparatively brief treatment must suffice for all of these.

§ 3. Among the Byzantine writers, to whom we are indebted for precious relics of the older Greek authors, perhaps the earliest, and certainly not the least important, is JOHN OF STOBI in Macedonia, generally known as STOBÆUS (Ἰωάννης ὁ Στοβαῖος or Στοβεύς).¹ His personal existence has vanished from all records, and even his date is determined rather by inference than by testimony. He mentions Hierocles,² who flourished about the middle of the fifth century, and does not name any subsequent writer. It is therefore concluded that he lived soon after that author.³ Then again, with the exception of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, he refers to none of the Christian Fathers, and there is a doubt whether even this reference is not a subsequent addition from some other hand. From this circumstance it is argued that Stobæus was a pagan. But paganism was not professed by any man of letters after the beginning of the sixth century. Stobæus therefore must have been at latest a contemporary of Justinian. On the other hand it must be admitted that the name 'John' was most probably imposed by Christian parents, and the imperfect state in which the work of Stobæus has come down to us, ought to check any undue precipitation in judging from its omissions. It is our impression that Stobæus belonged to the end rather than to the beginning of the first period of Byzantine literature.

The work, by which the name of Stobæus has been preserved from the oblivion which veils all the circumstances of his life, was a collection of miscellaneous selections in four books, entitled an 'Anthology of extracts, sayings, and precepts'.⁴ In the

¹ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπονομαζόμενος Στοβεῖς, is the reading in the best MSS. of Suidas.

² *Serm.* VIII. 19, XXXIX. 34—36, LXVII. 21—24, LXXV. 14, LXXIX. 53, LXXXIV. 20, 23, LXXXV. 21; *Eclog.* I. 4. 53, p. 136, 54, p. 138, II. 9. 7, p. 420.

³ Heeren thinks (*Comment. de font.* II. p. 138): 'Stobæi ætatem in secundam sæculi quinti partem inter A.D. 450—500 ponendam esse.'

⁴ Ἀνθολόγιον ἐκλογῶν, ἀποφθεγμάτων, ὑποθηκῶν. Suidas describes the book as: Ἀνθολόγιον περιέχον τὰς παρὰ πᾶσι πολλῶν δόξας ἐν βιβλίοις δ'.

modern editions, it appears as two distinct works; one in two books called 'Physical, dialectical, and moral extracts';¹ the other in a single book called the 'Anthology'—the proper name of all four books.² But Photius has given us a full account of the contents of the work as it was in his time, and we can see, by comparing his account of the third and fourth books with the 'Anthology' as we have it, that the two books are really combined in the latter. It is true that the forty-two chapters of the third book and the fifty-eight of the fourth book, as they were in the time of Photius, are represented by 126 in the existing 'Anthology;' but this is easily explained by the supposition that further subdivisions may have been made by subsequent copyists. The first two books, or the 'Eclogues,' as they are generally called, have come down to us in a very mutilated condition. The introduction to the whole work, which, according to Photius,³ contained a panegyric on philosophy contributed by various writers, an historical sketch of the ancient sects, and an account of their doctrines respecting geometry, music and arithmetic, is lost with the exception of the concluding portion. And of the forty-six chapters, into which the second book was divided, we have only the first nine. It would not be at all difficult to rearrange the book according to the original number of chapters, and it is clear that the modern editors should treat it as forming one work. The author dedicated his collections to his son Septimius in order to direct his mind, which was rather feeble, according to the best course of philosophic reading.⁴ The value of the work may be estimated by the fact that Stobæus has given us extracts from more than

¹ 'Εκλογαὶ φυσικαὶ διαλεκτικαὶ καὶ ἠθικαί.

² 'Ανθολόγιον, *Florilegium*.

³ *Cod. CLXVII.* p. 367: ἐν μέντοι τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις κεφαλαίοις ἐπιβαλεῖν, περὶ δύο κεφαλαίων διαλαμβάνει ὧν τὸ μὲν ἑπαινὸς ἐστὶ φιλοσοφίας καὶ οὗτος ἐκ διαφόρων αὐτῷ συνηραιομένης· τὸ δὲ περὶ τῶν κατὰ ταύτην συνεστηκνυῶν αἰρέσεων, ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ μουσικῆς καὶ ἀριθμητικῆς δόξας παλαιὰς συναναγράφει.

⁴ Phot. *Cod. CLXVII.* p. 365: προσφωνεῖται ταῦτα Σεπτιμίῳ ἰδίῳ υἱῷ. ἡ δὲ συναγωγή αὐτῷ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῷ ῥυθμίσαι καὶ βελτιῶσαι τῷ παιδί τὴν φύσιν ἀμαρρότερον ἔχουσαν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων στήλην. The common reading is Σεστιμίῳ. Suidas says: γράφει δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς Ἐπτίμιον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Whence it is clear that the true reading in Photius is what we have given, the form Ἐπτίμιος being introduced by Suidas on the analogy of ἑπτα and *septem*.

500 authors, many of whom are represented only by fragments, and that the comic writers, in particular, owe most of their extant relics either to Stobæus or to Athenæus. Among others, he has quoted more than 200 passages from Menander. The tragedians are not neglected. Sophocles has furnished Stobæus with 150 citations, and Euripides with more than 500. We are also indebted to this collector not only for many excerpts from lost works in prose, but for summaries of the opinions of ancient philosophers, which are not to be found elsewhere. And there can be no doubt that the Anthology of Stobæus deserves the titles of 'excellent and full of instruction' bestowed upon it by the lexicographer Suidas,¹ and that it merits the attribute of usefulness assigned to it by Photius.²

The other Byzantine writer, who has contributed by the records of his reading to the illustration of the ancient Greek authors, and to the preservation of fragments from the wreck of their works, was PHOTIUS, who occupies an important place in the ecclesiastical history of the ninth century. After having held the lay offices of captain of the body-guard (*Protospatharius*) and chief secretary (*Protosecretarius*) to the emperors Michael III., Basilus the Macedonian, and Leo the philosopher, he was raised to the patriarchal dignity in 857, and held the office for ten years, when he was deposed. Restored in 877, he was at the head of the Eastern Church till 886, when he was again deprived of his office and exiled. He died in banishment in 892. Photius was the first cause of the misunderstanding which ended in the dissolution of the union between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, and is, accordingly, an interesting personage in the history of that schism. For our present purpose, he deserves notice chiefly on account of his 'Library' and his 'Lexicon.'

The former of these works, (called the *Βιβλιοθήκη*, or *Μυριόβιβλος*), is a description, sometimes conveyed in brief notices, and sometimes illustrated by extracts more or less copious, from 280 works, which Photius read during the period of his Assyrian embassy. Its full title was 'a register and

¹ ἐνάρετα πάνυ καὶ γέμοντα πάσης παιδείσεως. Suidas, p. 1790, A. Gaisf.

² p. 376: χρήσιμον δὲ τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πρὸς ἄλλα δὲ τοῖς ῥητορεύειν καὶ γράφειν σπουδάζουσιν, οὐκ ἀχρηστον τὸ βιβλίον.

enumeration of the books read by us, of which our dear brother Tarasius requested a summary sketch, being in number 279.¹ The number of the *codices* is, however, 280 complete. The authors, who are noticed in this earliest specimen of bibliography, are not arranged in any methodical order. Even the same author appears as a fresh subject in different parts of the book.² In fact, the different items were probably committed to writing as the books were successively read;³ so that the *Bibliotheca* is a genuine record of the ambassador's miscellaneous studies. Most of the works passed in review are of a theological nature; but Photius has preserved some valuable remnants of the better writers whose works are lost either wholly or in part, and there are some seventy or eighty authors, for our knowledge of whom we are chiefly indebted to this compilation. Among these the most important are Ctesias, Theopompus, Nicolas of Damascus, Memnon of Heraclea, Phlegon of Tralles, Theophanes of Byzantium, Praxagoras of Athens, Eunapius of Sardis, the lost books of the natural history of Theophrastus, Ænesidemus, Hierocles, Joannes Philoponus, Dionysius Ægeus, the emperor Hadrian, Himerius, Agatharchides, Antonius Diogenes, Canon, and some lexicographers. Photius very often makes pertinent and acute remarks on the style of the different writers; and, on the whole, we may be thankful that he had his pen in his hand when he went through this long course of Greek reading, and that his affection for his brother induced him to keep this journal of his laborious studies.

The 'Lexicon' of Photius (λέξεων συναγωγή) is an alphabetical collection of words and phrases, principally from the orators and historians. Many of the articles are identical with those found in other vocabularies of the same kind.⁴ There are several gaps in the 'Lexicon' as it has come down to us,⁵

¹ Ἀπογραφή καὶ συναρίθμησις τῶν ἀνεγνωσμένων ἡμῖν βιβλίων, ὧν εἰς κεφαλαιῶδη ἀνάγνωσιν ὁ ἡγαπημένος ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Ταράσιος ἐξηγήσατο· ἐστὶ δὲ ταῦτα εἰκοσι δέοντων ἐφ' ἐνὶ τριακόσια.

² e.g. Eulogius, who is the last author mentioned, is also extracted in *Cod.* CCVIII., CCXXV., CCXXX., &c.

³ The different articles begin with ἀνεγνώσθη.

⁴ Especially the *Lexicon Sangermanense*, published by Bekker in his *Anecdota Græca*, which forms about a third part of the entire lexicon of Photius.

⁵ i.e. between ἀᾶσαι and ἀγχινόια, between ἀδιάκριτος and ἐπώνυμοι, between κοικύλλειν and κρατηρίων, between φορητῶς and ψιλεύς.

but it was considered of so much value by one of our greatest scholars,¹ that he transcribed the whole from Gale's manuscript, and repeated his labour when the first copy was destroyed by fire.

The original works of Photius were his Epistles; the epitome of Philostorgius; the *Nomocanon*, or harmony of imperial laws respecting ecclesiastical discipline; on the seven œcumenical councils; *Amphilochia*, or answers to the questions of Amphilochus; four books against the Manichæans; commentaries on St. Luke; on the procession of the Holy Spirit; dissertations on bishops and metropolitans, and homilies. All these are more or less valuable to the theologian.

The only other Byzantine collector of much importance was MAXIMUS PLANUDES, a monk of the fourteenth century, to whom we are indebted especially for the most usual form of our Greek anthology, or collection of epigrams and other minor poems.² He was also very active in translating Latin authors into his own language.

§ 4. Next in importance to the extracts and notices of such writers as Stobæus and Photius, and belonging, in fact, to the same class, were the various lexicons which appeared at Byzantium, and which, though often only new editions of works originally compiled at Alexandria, must be regarded, in their present form, as products of the Byzantine school. One of these useful glossaries we have already considered among the writings of Photius. There were many others of a similar description, and of greater extent and importance.

All that we know of VALERIUS HARPOCRATION is contained in the brief statement by Suidas,³ that he was a rhetorician of Alexandria; and that besides the 'Lexicon to the ten orators,' which has come down to us, he wrote a book of elegant extracts, which is lost. Even the age at which he flourished is quite uncertain; for while some identify him with the Harpocraton

¹ Richard Porson. His edition was published by Dobree, Lond. 1822.

² Below, p. 393.

³ Ἀρποκρατίων, ὁ Βαλέριος χρηματίσας, ῥήτωρ, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς. Λέξεις τῶν ἐκ ῥητόρων, Ἀνθηρῶν συναγωγῇ. That he was an Alexandrian appears from his translating the Attic ἀνακαλυπτήρια (s.v.) by the Alexandrine θεώρητρα. His name is derived from that of the Egyptian god Harpocrates (i.e. 'Horus the child,' Bunsen, *Egypten*, I. p. 505).

who taught Greek to the emperor L. Verus,¹ others recognize in him either the contemporary and friend of Libanius,² or the physician of Mendes, mentioned by Athenæus.³ It appears to us not at all improbable that the basis of our Lexicon may be due to the learned labours of a grammarian who was a contemporary of Julius Pollux, and was similarly employed in teaching an imperial prince, and that the extant work is a Byzantine abridgment, bearing, however, the name of the original author. The defects in the alphabetical arrangement show that the work is not in its genuine form. As it is, it forms the best extant auxiliary to the study of the Greek orators, and not only explains many phrases and allusions of judicial import, but also illustrates the proper names occurring in the speeches. Derived itself from ancient and good authorities, the Lexicon of Harpocration has been freely used by Suidas and the compilers of the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

HELLADIUS and AMMONIUS were Egyptian grammarians, who settled at Constantinople at the end of the fourth century. The dictionary of the former⁴ is known to us only through Photius. We have still the treatise on Greek synonyms⁵ by Ammonius.

Another Egyptian grammarian of about the same epoch was ORION the teacher of Proclus,⁶ who has left us an etymological lexicon, derived, as it seems, to a considerable extent, from a work by ORUS of Miletus.⁷

The most important Byzantine lexicon bears the name of HESYCHIUS of Alexandria, who appears to have lived in the latter part of the fourth century; but has unquestionably come down to us in modified form, including many additions of a much later date. Hesychius himself was probably a pagan, and a large portion of these additions consists in Biblical glosses, which must have proceeded from the pen of some Christian grammarian. The value of the work is not much enhanced by these later additions. But it is an inestimable aid to the study of the classical authors, especially Homer, because it embodies in a large measure the best traditions of the older grammarians

¹ Jul. Capit. *Vit. Veri*, 2.

² Libanius, *Epist.* 367.

³ XIV. p. 648 B.

⁴ Λέξεως παντοίας χρήσις κατὰ στοιχείον.

⁵ Περί ὁμολων καὶ διαφορῶν λέξεων.

⁶ Above, p. 309.

⁷ On this question see Ritschl, *De Oro et Orione Commentatio*, Breslau, 1834.

of Alexandria. It was derived immediately by Hesychius from the dictionary, in five books, by Diogenianus, who lived at Heraclea, in the Pontus, in the time of Hadrian; and this, again, was an extract from the great dictionary, in ninety-five books, by Pamphilus and Zopyrion, of the school of Aristarchus. In the dedication of the lexicon to a certain Eulogius, the author states that he had bestowed the greatest care on his work, and that he had transcribed with his own hand and the utmost correctness all the materials which he had derived from Aristarchus, Apion, Heliodorus, and Diogenianus. Unfortunately, the solitary manuscript which has come down to us is deformed by the grossest inaccuracies, and it has been one of the most difficult tasks imposed on modern criticism to restore the confused readings of Hesychius.

The author of the great lexicon which bears the name of SUIDAS is known to us only from the title-page of this compilation, and from some citations in the commentary of Eustathius.¹ That he was a Byzantine monk is merely a conjecture, started by Joannes Rosinus, and adopted by subsequent scholars.² Even the age in which he flourished is quite uncertain; for it cannot be ascertained whether the references to certain personages of a comparatively modern date belong to the original fabric of the lexicon, or were subsequent additions. In regard to some of the latest of these citations, the fact that, in the best manuscripts, they are either wanting altogether or added in the margin, has been alleged as a proof of their being interpolations.³ But the writer was evidently anterior to Eustathius, who flourished at the end of the twelfth and at the beginning of the thirteenth century. And there seems to be no good reason for doubting the genuineness of the two articles in which he carries down the annals of the world to the death of John Trimisces in A.D. 975,⁴ or of

¹ There are about eleven citations of Suidas in Eustathius, in one of which (*ad Iliad.* λ', p. 834) the lexicon is thus described: ἐν τῷ κατὰ στοιχείου μεγάλῳ βιβλίῳ τοῦ Σουῖδα.

² 'Non dubito,' says Fabricius, 'ex sola conjectura a Rosino et aliis hoc pronunciatum fuisse, quemadmodum ab Is. Casaubono, qui *cucullatum grammaticum* nuncupat, lib. I. c. 6, ad Athenæum.'

³ See Kuster's Preface, p. VII., Gaisford.

⁴ s. v. 'Αδάμ.

that in which he speaks of the successors of that emperor, Basil the Second, who reigned till 1025, and Constantine, who reigned till 1028, as holding the sceptre in his own time.¹ Whether, therefore, we accept or reject the references to Michael Psellus,² who lived under Alexius Comnenus, the eleventh century will be the most probable epoch for the writer of this lexicon.

But the age of Suidas is of less consequence, in estimating the value of his compilation, than the sources from which it was derived. This book is not merely a lexicon, properly so called—that is, an alphabetical explanation of common words. It also deals with proper names, and its chief value consists in the literary notices with which it abounds, and in the fragments of lost works, with which it sometimes furnishes us. There is a certain uniformity in the style of the biographical sketches, and the author has told us himself that in this department his book is an epitome of the *Onomatologium* drawn up by Hesychius of Miletus.³ With regard to the more strictly lexical part of his work, he gives us a list of the dictionaries from which he had compiled it—namely, those of Eudemus, Helladius, Eugenius, Zosimus, Cæcilius of Calacte, Longinus, Lupereus, Julius Vestinus, Pacatus, Pamphilus, and Valerius Pollio. But, besides these lexicons, it is clear that he had used very freely the scholia on ancient writers, especially those on Aristophanes. The literary merits of the compiler are very insignificant. He exhibits, unless his copyists have done him signal injustice, the grossest carelessness in his citations, and a total absence of all sound judgment and criticism. His arrangement is faulty and confused. He often makes inconsistent statements; and the alphabetical order of the words often shows

¹ s.v. Κωνσταντινὸπολις : ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς κτίσεως τῆς νέας Ῥώμης μέχρι τῶν κατεχόντων τὰ σκῆπτρα Ῥωμαίων Βασιλείου καὶ Κωνσταντίνου τῶν Πορφυρογεννῆτων ἔτη [χρῆ].

² s.vv. Γηώρας, Δέρτρον, Ἡγήτορες.

³ Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος—ἔγραψεν Ὀνοματολόγιον ἢ Πίνακα τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ ὀνομαστῶν, οὗ ἐπιτομή ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον. Näke (*ad Chærilum*, p. 35) understands these words as follows : 'Hesychius Milesius scripsit Ὁ. ἢ Π. cujus epitome est hicce liber qui nunc Hesychii Milesii nomine inscribitur.' But we cannot see how they can bear such a meaning.

that an error in transcription is as old as the book itself.¹ The value of the lexicon, however, is independent of the literary character of its unknown author; and it has received, as it deserves, the greatest attention from scholars, to whom it serves as an invaluable substitute for many better books which are irreparably lost.

The remaining great lexicon of the Byzantine age, the *ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM* as it is called, does not puzzle us by assuming the name of any definite author. It may, indeed, be doubted whether there was not more than one compilation bearing this name, and whether it denoted more than a book-seller's or scribe's collection and edition of divers glossaries made up from the works of the most eminent grammarians. The work has already appeared in two different forms, derived from manuscripts of two different classes: the one, which is sometimes called the *Etymologicum Sylburgianum*, because the first critical revision was that which Sylburg founded on the original publication of Marcus Musurus, the other, which is termed the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, because it was derived by Sturz from a manuscript at Wolfenbüttel, belonging originally to Marquard Gude. There is, indeed, reason to suppose that the work published by Musurus got its title of *Etymologicum Magnum* from its first editor or from its printer Calliergus.² At least it seems that where their book referred to an Ἑτυμολογικὸν μέγα, they altered the word μέγα into ἄλλο. There are no marks of individual authorship in the book as we have it; for when such phrases as οὕτως ἐγώ, εὔρον ἐγώ, occur, they belong rather to the grammarians from whom the compilation is derived than to the compiler himself. The age of the work may, however, with some probability, be assigned to the tenth century or thereabouts. It may be best described as a farrago of extracts from the most esteemed grammarians, copied slavishly and arranged in alphabetical order. The sources of

¹ For example, Ἡμιμάλλωνες, for αἱ μιμάλλωνες stands between Ἡμικύκλιον and Ἡμιμέδιμνον.

² Gaisford, *Præf. ad Etym. M.* p. 3: 'Magni cognomen indidit sive Marcus Musurus sive Zacharias Calliergus, hoc fortasse consilio, ut plures ad librum coemendum allicerent.'

these extracts are the original *Etymologicum Magnum*, another dictionary or two of the same kind, a lexicon of rhetoric, an index to the *Iliad*, Diogenianus, Orus, Orion, the scholia on Homer, Hesiod, and the Alexandrine poets, and occasionally those on the tragedians and Pindar; the grammarians, Herodian, Methodius, George Chæroboscus, and others. The etymologies of the book, in the modern sense of the term, are generally worthless, but it has a high value as preserving many forms of words otherwise unknown, and as containing a number of fragments from the lost Greek authors.

There were other lexicons of the Byzantine age, such as those of THOMAS MAGISTER and GEORGE LECAPENUS, who published lists of Attic words compiled from various sources, about the beginning of the fourteenth century, and the useful collections by anonymous authors, which are known as the lexicons of Segulier, because they passed from his library into the great *Bibliothèque* at Paris. But no one of these deserves a special notice.

§ 5. The grammarians and commentators, to whom the lexicographers just mentioned owed a large part of their materials, or who borrowed in turn from them, formed a very numerous class at Byzantium. Up to the time (A.D. 750), when Leo III., in his iconoclastic frenzy, burned the library of the Octagon and the œcumenical university, there were many points of resemblance between Constantinople and the Alexandria of the Ptolemies. The capital of the eastern empire entertained a flourishing school of grammarians, who, however, taught rather than wrote. After that event, those, whose tastes led them to the interpretation of the ancient authors, were obliged to use their pens as instruments of instruction, and a number of writers appeared who have gained more or less celebrity.

In the time of the œcumenical schools, the most eminent grammarian was GEORGE, surnamed by his enemies CHÆROBOSCUS, and by his friends TECHNICUS. He lived in the fourth and fifth centuries, and published some six treatises on various points of Greek grammar; they have come down to us in a separate form, but are also, in a large measure, incorporated in the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

The grammar of DIONYSIUS THE THRACIAN was a text-book at Byzantium, and one of his chief expositors was THEODOSIUS of Alexandria, whose date is unknown. Some of his works are still extant.

Of the Byzantine commentators by far the most eminent was EUSTATHIUS, who died as archbishop of Thessalonica in 1198. He is best known by a commentary on Homer, compiled with great diligence from the lost works of the Alexandrian critics. As a substitute for these more ancient scholia the book is of great value. Eustathius also wrote commentaries on Pindar and Dionysius Periegetes. Of the former, only the introduction is still extant.

JOHN TZETZES, who flourished about the middle of the twelfth century, was one of the most learned men of Byzantium, and, having a wonderful memory, was regarded by his contemporaries, or at least represented by himself, as a sort of literary prodigy. Besides his poetical works, he wrote treatises on grammar and metres, an exposition of the *Iliad*, and scholia on Hesiod. The learned commentary on the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, which is attributed by the manuscripts to his brother ISAAC, is claimed by him in a letter and in his *Chiliades*; and the rights of both brothers are maintained by J. C. Müller, the latest editor of this exposition, who thinks that Isaac drew up the first sketch, which was filled up and completed by his more learned brother John. Like Eustathius, Tzetzes made up his commentaries from the Alexandrian scholia.

DEMETRIUS TRICLINIUS, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, was a compiler of scholia on Hesiod, Pindar, Sophocles, and Aristophanes. He was also the author of a revised text of Sophocles, which was the established recension till a very recent period, and wrote a prose treatise on metres.

§ 6. Oratory did not flourish during the period now under consideration. In the reign of Justinian, the celebrated historian PROCOPIUS gained some reputation as a rhetorician, and his pupil CHORICIUS has left us about twenty speeches and as many dissertations of the old sophistic description. In the seventh century THEOPHYLACTUS SIMOCATTA¹ (ὁ Σιμοκάττης or Σιμό-

¹ Suid. says: Σιμοκάττης, ἐπώνυμον Θεοφυλάκτου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ, but there are

καττος) prefixed to his history of the world a dialogue between philosophy and history, written in the sophistic style, and has also left us eighty-five 'moral, rustic, and amatory epistles,' which belong to the same class as those of the older rhetoricians. Photius, who gives an elaborate abstract of his history, characterizes his style as not without grace, but overloaded with metaphors and forced allegories, and sinking to frigid conceits and puerile want of taste.¹ The twelfth century produced a sophist of very considerable pretensions in THEODORUS PRODROMUS or PROCHOPRODROMUS, a monk who was known in the cloister as *Hilarion*, and is sometimes designated by the complimentary epithet Κυρός (*i.e.* Κύριος, *magister*, 'Doctor'). Besides a number of poems chiefly in iambic verse, Theodore Prodromus wrote treatises on rhetoric, dialogues, discourses and letters; his highest flights were imitations of Lucian, especially an essay called 'the sale of poetical and political lives,' in imitation of the great satirist's 'sale of lives.' An anonymous effort of the same kind and published in the same century has been attributed to Prodromus. It is called 'Timarion, or concerning what happened to himself,' and represents, in a very satirical manner, what the author had seen in the infernal regions, whither he was transported by two genii. Without the gravity of Dante or the wit of Lucian, it trenches on the subjects of both. The writer of this book calls himself a Capadocian, and his style is altogether different from that of Prodromus.

GEORGE of CYPRUS, a monk whose cloister name was *Gregory*, became patriarch of Constantinople in 1283, and died seven years afterwards. He was an elegant rhetorician, and his 'praise of the sea,' which has found its way into print, is a favourable specimen of his talents as a writer. THEODORUS HYRTACENUS, that is, as is suggested by his editor, La Porte du Theil, not of Hyrtacus in Crete but of Artace near Cyzicus, flourished in the early part of the fourteenth century, when he was at the public schools of Constantinople. That he was deeply

variations in the MSS. as to the orthography of the name, which cannot be settled, as we do not know its origin or signification.

¹ *Cod.* LXV.: ἡ μέντοι φράσις αὐτῷ ἔχει μὲν τι χάριτος πλὴν γε δὴ ἡ τῶν τροπικῶν λεξέων κατακορὴς χρῆσις εἰς ψυχρολογίαν τινὰ καὶ νεανικὴν ἀπειροκαλίαν ἀποτελεῦται.

imbued with classic lore, appears from the fact that his poetical writings on the most Christian subjects are full of allusions borrowed from heathen mythology, and that in his eulogium on St. Anne he introduces by way of episode the fable of Niobe. His orations and letters have been published during the present century.¹ A little later than Hyrtacenus, DEMETRIUS of CYDON became distinguished as a sophist at Constantinople, till he retired into a monastery along with John Cantacuzenus in 1355. His works, besides three on theological subjects, were as follows: (a) 'a monody on those who fell at Thessalonica,' in 1343; (b) 'a discourse addressed to the Greeks,' in 1369, when the Turks became dangerous; (c) 'on the contempt of death,' in which he maintains the immortality of the soul.

§ 7. Several of the grammarians and sophists whom we have mentioned were also poets, or at any rate verse-makers. The best known of them for their efforts in this respect were THEODORUS PRODROMUS and JOHN TZETZES, both of whom, as we have seen, flourished in the twelfth century. The former wrote a romance in iambic verse, entitled, 'the loves of Rhodanthe and Dosicles;' 'the battle of the cat and the mice' (Γαλεομνομαχία), an imitation of the Homeric *Batrachomyomachia*, but in iambs; and a dialogue, called 'Friendship banished' (ἀπόδημος Φιλία), which describes how the World, under the influence of its slave Folly, divorced Friendship, and married Enmity. John Tzetzes attempted poetry on a much larger scale. He wrote:—(a) A sort of abridgment of the epic cycle, under the general title of Ἰλιακά, but comprising three separate works, τὰ πρὸ Ὀμήρου, which gives the Trojan history from the birth of Paris to the tenth year of the siege; τὰ Ὀμήρου, which gives a summary of the *Iliad*; and τὰ μεθ' Ὀμήρου, which contains about the same range of subjects as the similar work of Quintus Smyrnaeus. The poem, which has but little merit, extends only to 1665 hexameters. (b) A series of mythological and historical narrations, called the βίβλος ἱστορική, but generally known as 'the thousands' (*Chiliades*), from the name given to it by its first editor, Nicolas Gerbel, who divided the 12,675 lines, of which it

¹ Seven of his orations appear in Boissonade's *Anecdota Græca*, I. p. 248 sqq. II. and III. init. and 93 of his letters have been published by La Porte du Theil, *Notices et Extraits*, V. p. 709 sqq.; VI. p. 1 sqq.

consists, into thirteen chiliads, the last being incomplete. This division was made without any reference to the contents, as will be seen by comparing it with the author's own arrangement in three *πίνακες*, or 'tables.' The first of these tables, containing 141 narratives, extends as far as *Chiliad* IV. v. 466; then follows a letter addressed to John Lachares, and recapitulating the contents of the first table; this extends to *Chiliad* IV. v. 780; the second table is from *Chiliad* IV. v. 781, to *Chiliad* V. v. 192, and comprises twenty-three narratives; and the third table, which goes down to the end of the book, comprises 496 narratives. Not only are the divisions of Tzetzes thus unequal, but his stories follow without any real connexion. History and fable are mixed up in the most admired confusion. The account of Bucephalus stands between the history of Hannibal and the description of the dress of Antisthenes the Sybarite; Cato follows Scesostris; Belisarius comes immediately after Ajax and Agamemnon, and is followed by Darius Codomannus and Atlas. There is a great affectation of reading, but the author is better acquainted with the commentators than the original texts of the classical writers. The metre, if it deserves the name, is that which is called 'the political verse' (*versus politicus*, or the metre of common discourse). It seems to be a sort of tetrameter iambic catalectic, containing on an average fifteen syllables, the quantity of which is sometimes regulated by the accentuation, as in modern Greek.¹ (c) A poem in iambic verse, 'on the education of children.' (d) An allegorical exposition of Homer (*Ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Ὀμήρου*), in more than 8000 political verses.

But besides these sophistical or grammatical poets of the twelfth century, there was a certain amount of independent verse-making throughout the whole of the Byzantine period.

¹ Foster, speaking of the accents, says (*Essay on Accent and Quantity*, p. 202): 'in the rambling poems of John Tzetzes, written in the twelfth century, they are by some persons imagined to have regulated his metre. On this supposition most of his *versus politici* are tetrameter iambic catalectic.' But in his note he remarks (p. 203): 'I do myself strongly suspect that those verses are not iambs regulated by accent, but loose trochaics, as independent of it as any in Euripides. Vossius himself says, *maximé similes sunt Archilochiis catalecticis*. And Eustathius, as cited by him, speaking of these verses says: *σώζεται ὁ τροχαϊκὸς ῥυθμὸς*.' That the view in the text is the correct one appears from the statements quoted by Ducange (Gaisford, *Hephæstion*, p. 249).

In the reign of Justinian, PAUL the 'silentary,' or usher who kept silence in the imperial palace,¹ composed a number of epigrams and occasional poems.² In the latter part of the same century AGATHIAS of Myrina in Æolia, who is well known as a historian, published a series of epigrams, and a collection of love-poems called *Δαφνιακά*. In the seventh century³ GEORGE THE PISIDIAN, who filled the office of *chartophylax*, i.e., keeper of the archives and referendary at Constantinople, wrote epic poems 'on the expedition of the emperor Heraclius against the Persians,'⁴ and 'on the expedition of the Avars and its failure.'⁵ In the twelfth century CONSTANTINE MANASSES wrote 'the loves of Aristander and Callithea' in political verse, and MANUEL HOLOBÔLUS composed panegyrics in the same questionable metre. In the fourteenth century MANUEL PHILE of Ephesus published political verses on subjects of natural history, Christian legends, and moral epilogues; and JOHN PEDIASIMUS or GALENUS indited a short iambic poem 'on the good and bad wife, or the desire' (*περὶ γυναικὸς κακῆς καὶ ἀγαθῆς ἢ πόθοις*).

The poetical taste, however, of the Byzantine men of letters was better shown in their *Anthologies* or collections of the shorter poems of their predecessors, than by any efforts of their own. The anthologies, previously published by Meleager, Philippus, and others,⁶ had contained, of course, only the short poems of their predecessors and contemporaries. The first of the Byzantine writers who attempted to make a more complete collection was AGATHIAS, whose *Κύκλος* in seven books is lost, with the exception of the introduction. The second was that of CONSTANTINE CEPHALAS, who flourished at the end of the ninth century. This, which was the most important of these collections, was arranged in fifteen sections, and contained the best specimens of every class and every age. The third was that of MAXIMUS PLANUDES, a monk of the fourteenth century;

¹ Agathias, V. 9, p. 153 A: τὰ πρῶτα τελῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὸν βασιλέα συγῆς ἐπιστάταις.

² Among other subjects, he chose the dedication of St. Sophia as the theme of his hexameters. Agathias says (u.s.) that any one who reads these verses will be able to realize the scene *καθάπερ παρὼν καὶ θεώμενος*.

³ He was still writing in the nineteenth year of Heraclius, A.D. 628.

⁴ *Ἡρακλίας εἰς τὴν τελείαν πτώσιν Χοσρόου βασιλέως Περσῶν*.

⁵ *Εἰς τὴν γενομένην ἐφοδὸν τῶν βαρβάρων*.

⁶ See above, chapter L. § 3.

it was divided into seven books, and was an extract from the anthology of Cephalaſ. During the firſt two centuries after the revival of ancient literature the anthology of Planudes was the only collection known to the ſcholars of Europe. Early in the ſeventeenth century, Claude Saumaſie (Salmaſius) diſcovered the greater part of the anthology of Cephalaſ in a manuſcript belonging to the Palatine Library of Heidelberg. This manuſcript was preſented to the pope in 1623 by the king of Spain, whoſe troops had taken Heidelberg. From Rome it went to Paris in 1797, and in 1815 was reſtored to its original home in the Palatinate. From this manuſcript, the anthology of Cephalaſ, now known as the *Anthologia Palatina*, was firſt published by F. Jacobs in 1813.

§ 8. The moſt voluminous department of the Byzantine writers was that of the hiſtorians, who, as we have mentioned, fall into four claſſes. There were hiſtorians eſtabliſhed and writing at Conſtantinople before the ſeries of authors, to whom the name of Byzantine hiſtorians is generally confined. The chief of theſe were the following.

PRAXAGORAS of Athens wrote the hiſtory of Conſtantine the Great in two books, beſides hiſtorical works on the Athenian kings and on Alexander the Great. He adopted the Ionic dialect. EUNAPIUS of Sardis, the friend of Prohæreſius,¹ wrote a continuation of the hiſtory of Dexippus, beginning with the death of Claudius in A.D. 270 and going down to A.D. 404. PRISCUS of Panium in Thrace wrote a hiſtory of the war with Attila, and carried down the hiſtory of the empire to the year 474. ZOSIMUS, who flouriſhed in the reign of Theodoſius the younger, compiled a general hiſtory of the decline and fall of the Roman power in ſix books. The hiſtory of Priscus was continued by MALCHUS of Philadelphia from 474 to 480. And in the reign of Juſtinian, PROCOPIUS of Cæſarea, in Paleſtine,² the ſecretary of Beliaſarius,³ wrote an extremely valuable hiſtory in eight books (τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν ἱſτοριῶν βιβλία ὀκτώ), two on the Per-

¹ Above, chapter LVIII. § 5.

² Suidas, s.v.; Procop. *Anecd.* p. 35 B; Agathias, *Proem.* p. 7 D.

³ He was the companion of Beliaſarius in nearly all his campaigns. He ſays (*Pers.* I. 1, p. 63): αὐτῷ ξυμβούλῳ ἡρῆμένῳ Βελιſαρίῳ τῷ ſτρατηγῷ ſχεδὸν τι ἀπασί παραγενέſθαι τοῖς πεπραγμένοις ξυνέπεσε.

sian war, two on the war with the Vandals, and four on the Gothic war. This work stands in such marked contrast to 'the secret history' (ἀνέκδοτα), which bears the name of Procopius, that the genuineness and authenticity of the latter work have been called in question. But there is really no reason why a courtier should not have given a more flattering view of the imperial house in a work intended for publication during his lifetime, while he told the bitter truth in memoirs and anecdotes, which he designed only for the edification of posterity.

The series of the Byzantine historians, generally so-called, commences after Procopius; and the first class is made up of the following writers, whose works form a continuous series of Byzantine annals, from the time of Constantine the Great to the taking of the capital by the Turks. The first part of these annals was written by JOHN ZONARAS,¹ whose *Χρονικὸν* extends from the creation of the world to the death of Alexis in 1118, soon after which Zonaras seems to have died as a monk on Mount Athos. This work was continued down to the year 1206 by NICETAS ACOMINATUS, who died at Nicæa in 1216. His work, in twenty-one books, is divided into ten distinct histories: the first, in one book, contains the period from 1118 to 1143; the second, in seven books, gives us the reign of Manuel Comnenus, 1143—1180; the third, in one book, is devoted to the short reign of Alexis II., who was murdered in 1183; the fourth history, in two books, contains the reign of Andronicus II., 1183—1185; the fifth, in three books, that of Isaac II., 1185—1195; the sixth, in three books, that of Alexis III., 1195—1203; the seventh, in one book, relates the restoration of Isaac II. and the reign of Alexis IV. in 1203, 1204; the eighth, in one book, that of Alexis V. in 1204; the ninth, in one book, describes the taking of the city by the Latins and what followed until the accession of Baldwin; and the last history relates the reign of Baldwin from 1204—1206. The period from 1204 to 1359 forms the subject of the Roman history (ἱστορία Ῥωμαϊκή), of NICEPHORUS GREGORAS (Νικηφόρος ὁ Γρηγοράς), of Heraclea Pontica. This work consisted of thirty-eight books; of which only the first twenty-four are

¹ See Niebuhr, *Lectures on Roman History*, I. p. 75.

published, carrying down the annals of Constantinople to the year 1331. The remaining author of the first class is NICOLAS or LAONICUS CHALCONDYLES of Athens, who wrote the history of the Turks and of the fall of the Byzantine empire. This work, in ten books, comprises the period from 1297 to 1462. The style is pleasing,¹ and though his facts are sometimes overlaid with the results of ill-informed credulity, the author gives a very interesting account, the only one we have in Greek, of the commencements of German, French, and English civilisation.²

§ 9. The Byzantine historians of the second class are distinguished from those of the first by the more strictly chrono-

¹ This is not the opinion of Bekker, who says in the preface to his edition (*Bonnæ*, 1843) that Laonicus Chalcondyles is *lectu ingratus*, that whereas he might have written intelligibly, like Ducas and Phrantzes, he preferred to imitate Herodotus: 'itaque dum Junonem captat, a nube adeo decipitur, ut sæpe ne ipse quidem quid dicere velit nosse videatur.'

² It is very amusing to read in the Greek of Chalcondyles the sort of information respecting the great nations of the north and west which found its way to Constantinople in the fifteenth century. He says of the Germans (p. 71, 21 sqq., Bekker) that the single combat (*μονομαχία*) is more common among them than in any other nation, so that they fight duels (*μονομαχεῖν*) not on horseback (as in the tournament) but on foot; that they are very ingenious in manufacturing warlike engines, and that some attribute to them the invention of cannons (*τηλεβόλοι*) and guns (*τηλεβόλσκοι*), which have passed from them to the rest of the world. In speaking of France he refers (p. 87) to the exploits of Orlando, Rinaldo, Oliver, and the other Paladins (*παλατινων καλουμένων*), he notices the affinity of the French and Italian languages (p. 89), he tells us that the French thought themselves the first nation in the west until their pride was tamed by the English (*ibid.*), he describes the battle of Agincourt (p. 90), which he makes the consequence of a war undertaken by the French for the recovery of Calais (*Καλέδη*, p. 89), and he gives an account of Joan of Arc, *γυνή τις τὸ εἶδος οὐ φαύλη, φαιμένη ἐαυτῇ χρηματίζειν τὸν θεόν* (p. 91, l. 14). His account of the British islands and their inhabitants is very curious. He supposes that they were united under one government in his time (p. 92). He speaks of the feudal independence of the nobility (p. 93), and of the civil dissensions between them and the king (*ibid.*). He tells us that England produces an extraordinary quantity of wool, and that a great number of garments are woven in the country. The language of the English is peculiar, but their manners and customs resemble those of the French. He is particularly struck by the English custom of inviting a visitor to salute the wife and children of his host with a kiss. The city of London (*Λονδρῶν ἡ πόλις*) is described as one of the most opulent cities in the west (p. 94). The long bows of the English archers attracted his attention. When he speaks of our countrymen as using *θυρεοὶς ἰταλικοῖς καὶ ξίφεσιν ἑλληνικοῖς*, he perhaps means Milan harness and Damascus blades. He has a great deal to say about the tides in the Thames, of which he received some very exaggerated description (pp. 94—96).

graphical form which they gave to their works, and by their general object, which was to relate universal rather than particular history. The work of Zonaras, which we have mentioned at the head of the first class, was, as its name denotes, a chronicle commencing with the creation of the world; but it resembles the books of the second class only in its earlier portions; the greater part being a detailed history of the author's own times; whereas, the chroniclers whom we are about to mention were mere compilers of historical compendiums, which do not pretend to give us the experiences of their writers.

GEORGE THE SYNCELLUS, or 'associate' of the patriarch Tarasius, flourished in the latter half of the eighth century,¹ and wrote 'an extract of chronology' ('Εκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας), commencing with the creation, and going down to the time of Diocletian, or A.D. 285. Many of its facts were derived from the chronicle of Eusebius. The work of Syncellus was continued to the year 813 by THEOPHANES THE ISAURIAN, who died in 817. A similar work to that of Syncellus was compiled in the ninth century by JOHN of Antioch, generally known by his Syriac surname MALALAS, 'the rhetorician;' his chronicle began with Adam, and went down to the year 566. The chronicle of Theophanes was continued by JOHN SCYLITZA, sometimes known by one of his surnames, THRACESIUS, derived from his office of governor of the Thracian district, or Asia Minor, and sometimes by another surname, CUROPALATA, or head of the board of works. His 'abridgment of history' (ἐπιτομὴ ἱστοριῶν) extends from 811 to 1081. Theophanes was also continued by LEO THE GRAMMARIAN and GEORGE THE MONK. Three unknown authors² have carried the CHRONICON PASCHALE from the creation of the world to the middle of the eleventh century. This chronicle, which gets its name from its being based on the Easter canons, originally terminated with the year 354. This part of the work has been attributed, without much reason, to GEORGE, Bishop of Alexandria, in the

¹ He wrote A.D. 808. See Clinton, *F. R.* II. p. 335.

² Mr. Clinton maintains that there was only one compiler of the *Paschal Chronicle*, and that he lived in the reign of Heraclius, for the chronicle in the extant copy ends with the narrative, May 15, A.D. 628; see *F. R.* II. pp. 169, 209.

seventh century.¹ It was afterwards continued down to the year 360, and completed by a catalogue of the emperors to 1042. NICEPHORUS, Patriarch of Constantinople, by which title he is generally distinguished, was deprived of that office by the iconoclasts in 806, and died in a monastery in 828. His Chronography (Χρονογραφία) extends from the beginning of the world to the end of his own life, and has been carried a little farther by some editor. He also wrote an abridgment of history (ἱστορία σύντομος), embracing the period from 602 to 770. GEORGE CEDRENIUS, a monk of the eleventh century, compiled from Scylitza and others a compendium of history (σύνοψις ἱστορική) from the beginning of the world to 1057. The chronicle of SIMEON METAPHRASTES is carried down to 963, when Nicephoras Phocas became emperor, and was continued to the accession of Constantine Ducas in 1059. MICHAEL GLYCAS wrote a book of chronology (βίβλος χρονική), which terminates in 1118; and CONSTANTINE MANASSES, who flourished in the middle of the twelfth century, composed a chronological synopsis (σύνοψις ἱστορική) in political verse.

§ 10. In the third class of Byzantine historians we place those writers who confined themselves to particular epochs, and generally wrote history in the form of biography. AGATHIAS, whom we have mentioned as a poet and editor of epigrams, and whose poetical tendencies are not only avowed, but occasionally exemplified in his prose writings, composed five books of history, with the title *περὶ τῆς Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλείας*, ‘on the reign of Justinian.’ The period embraced is 553 to 559, so that the work forms a sort of sequel to that of Procopius.² This history was continued to the year 582, by MENANDER of Constantinople.³ In the seventh century⁴ THEOPHYLACTUS SIMOCATTA,

¹ This was Ouden’s opinion. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* I. p. 577; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* VII. 451, VIII. p. 457, XII. p. 16. This George of Alexandria wrote a prolix life of Chrysostom.

² This at least was the intention of the writer. He says (*Proem.* p. 10 B): ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐς ἔκτον τε καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλείας γεγέννηται. καὶ Προκοπίω μὲν τῷ ῥήτορι ἐν τοῖσδε οἶμαι αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς ξιγγραφῆς διήμισται καὶ ξυντελέσθη, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐς τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτων, ἐφ’ ἅπερ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὠρμήθην ἵεναι, καὶ δὴ ἐπὶ ταῦτα εἰμι.

³ Suidas, s.v. Μένανδρος, προτίκτωρ, ἱστορικός.

⁴ He wrote in the reign of Heraclius (VIII. 12, p. 214 B), and after the death of Chosroes in A.D. 628 (p. 214 C).

who has been mentioned among the sophists, published a 'general history' (*ἱστορία οἰκουμένης*) in eight books, including the period from 582 to 602. In the fourth and fifth books, which recount the war with the Persians in 591, he derived a great part of his materials from JOHN of EPIPHANEIA, whose special work on this subject is still in manuscript at Heidelberg. To this class belongs also the 'life and actions of Basil the Macedonian' (*ἱστορικὴ διήγησις τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν πράξεων Βασιλείου τοῦ ἀοιδίμου βασιλέως*), including the period from 867 to 886. This book was compiled by his grandson, CONSTANTINE VI. PORPHYROGENITUS. An introduction to this monograph, including the period from 813 to 867, was drawn up by JOSEPH GENESIUS, at the command of Constantine, whose work was continued by an anonymous writer down to the year 963. This history was carried a little farther by LEO DIACONUS, who was born about the middle of the tenth century, at Caloe, in Lydia, and wrote 'a history in ten books,' including the reigns of Romanus II., Nicephorus Phocas, and John Zimisceus, or the period from 959 to 975. For the succeeding period down to 1039 we have a special work by MICHAEL CONSTANTINE PSELLUS, who was one of the most learned and various writers of the eleventh century. By the command of the empress Irene, NICEPHORUS BRYENNIUS, who had married her daughter the celebrated ANNA COMMENA, undertook a history of the house of the Commeni, which has come down to us with the title 'Materials of History' (*ἡ ἱστορίας*). Anna herself continued her husband's work when she retired after his death to the leisure of a convent. The imperial authoress entitled her book 'the Alexiad' (*Ἀλεξιάς*). As its epic name denotes, it is mainly a prolix biography of her father Alexis I. It is in fifteen books, and includes the period from 1069 to 1118. The work is interesting in itself to the student of history, but it is most generally known as having supplied Sir Walter Scott with the subject and some of the materials for the last and feeblest of his romances.¹ One of the best of these special works was the account of the reigns of

¹ See Mr. Lockhart's introduction to *Count Robert of Paris*. He says (p. 7) of the *Alexiad* that it is 'certainly, with all its defects, the first historical work that has as yet proceeded from a female pen.'

Calo-Joannes and his son Manuel, which was published in four, six, or seven books, by JOHN CINNAMUS, and comprised the period from 1118 to 1176. In the thirteenth century GEORGE ACROPOLITA wrote a general chronicle and a special history, in a longer and in a more compendius form, of the period between the taking of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204 to their expulsion in 1261. The sequel of this work is found in the Byzantine history of GEORGE PACHYMERES (Παχυμέρης), born at Nicæa in 1242. Besides this history, in fifteen books, which went down to the year 1308, Pachymeres wrote a sort of poetical autobiography, and many philosophical works. The dethroned emperor JOHN VI. CANTACUZENUS employed and solaced the twenty years of his retirement to monastic life by writing a Byzantine history in four books, and extending over the period from 1320 to 1357, and thus including his own reign from 1347 to 1355. MICHAEL DUCAS, a descendant of the imperial house of that name, wrote a history of the period from 1341 to the taking of Lesbos by the Turks in 1462. It is preceded by a brief general chronicle, like those of the authors of the second class. GEORGE PHRANZES, who was also of imperial blood, and was distinguished as a soldier, wrote in four books the history of the Palæologi. His work commences with the year 1261, and goes down to the year 1477. It is the latest historical work of the Byzantine school.

§ 11. In the fourth class of the Byzantine historians it is usual to place a number of writers who rather illustrated the history, statistics, and antiquities of the empire, than undertook to describe the course of events, or to narrate the lives of the principal actors in them.

One of the earliest and most important of these subsidiary authors was JOANNES LAURENTIUS of Philadelphia, commonly known as LYDUS, 'the Lydian,' who was born A.D. 491,¹ and rose to the rank of *Cornicularius* or *Matricularius*²—that is,

¹ He was twenty-one in A.D. 511, when he first came to Constantinople, as he tells us himself (*de Mag. Rom.* III. 26, p. 192): ἔνα καὶ εἰκοστὸν τῆς ἡλικίας ἄγαν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Σεκουνδιανοῦ ὑπατείας ἐκ τῆς ἐνεργούσης με Φιλαδελφείας ὑπὸ τῷ Τιμῶν καὶ Αὐδία κειμένης παρήλθον εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν. He took to writing after serving as a soldier for forty years and four months, *Mag. Rom.* III. 30.

² Phot. *Cod.* CLXXX.

chief commissary of the Prætorium, under Justinian. His works, besides some poems, for the loss of which the world has not been inconsolable, were treatises on the Roman calendar (*περὶ μηνῶν συγγραφή*), on the Roman magistrates (*περὶ ἀρχῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας*), and on portents (*περὶ διοσημειῶν*). The second of these works, which, in spite of its glaring faults, is the most valuable of these compilations, was discovered in the year 1784, in a manuscript of the tenth century.¹

HESYCHIUS OF MILETUS, generally known as ILLUSTRIOUS (ὁ Ἰλλούστριος), was an advocate of Constantinople under the emperors Anastasius I., Justin I., and Justinian.² He wrote : (a) a compendium of general history (*ἱστορικὸν ὡς ἐν συνόψει κοσμικῆς ἱστορίας*), from the reign of Belus to the death of Anastasius in A.D. 518 ; (b) a sort of biographical dictionary of literary men (*περὶ τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ ὀνομαστῶν*), which, as we have mentioned, was to a large extent incorporated in the lexicon of Suidas ; (c) an antiquarian tract on the origin of Constantinople (*πάτρια Κωνσταντινοπόλεως*), inserted in the *Origines* of George Codinus, and perhaps a part of the first work. It is this treatise, in particular, which gains for Hesychius a place in the fourth class of Byzantine historians.

The Emperor CONSTANTINE VI. (some reckon him as the VII.) PORPHYROGENITUS was the author of a considerable number of works, among which it may be sufficient to mention, in addition to his biography of Basil, his treatises on the provinces of the Eastern empire (*περὶ τῶν θεμάτων*), on the administration of the empire (*πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν Ῥωμανόν*), on the ceremonies of the court (*ἐκθesis τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως*), on naval and military tactics (*βιβλίον τακτικόν, τάξιν περιέχον τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ γῆν μαχομένων*), and on the strategies of different nations (*βιβλίον στρατηγικὸν περὶ ἐθνῶν διαφόρων*).

¹ It was first edited by Schow in 1794. It is full of ignorance, confusion, and blunders. The third treatise was published in a more complete form than it had previously exhibited by C. B. Hase in 1824.

² Suidas, s.v. describes him as *γεγονώς ἐπὶ Ἀναστασίου βασιλέως*. Photius, (*Cod.* LXIX.) says merely that he carried down his history to the death of that monarch. That he was a contemporary of Justinian, Procopius, Agathias, and Menander, is stated by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Themut.* tom. III. p. 18, ed. Bonn.

ἔθνω). He is perhaps best known by the library, which he formed chiefly of works on history, moral philosophy, geography, public, rural, and domestic economy, and natural history; and by the general synopsis of its contents (κεφαλαιώδης ὑπόθεσις) made under his directions by THEODOSIUS the younger. This book of summaries and abstracts was divided into fifty-three parts, each having its appropriate title. Only the twenty-seventh and fiftieth parts, 'on embassies' (περὶ πρεσβειῶν), and 'on virtue and vice' (περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας), have been preserved. They are of great importance, not only as containing fragments which make good many deficiencies in Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, Nicolas of Damascus, Appian, Dion Cassius, and John of Antioch, but also as supplying us with some remains of Dexippus, Herennius, Eunapius, Priscus, Malchus, Menander Protector, and Theophylactus Simocatta.

GEORGE CODINUS, the CUROPALATES, who was living at the time of the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, was the author of two antiquarian treatises:—(a) 'On the officials of the palace of Constantinople, and on the offices of the great Church' (περὶ τῶν ὀφφικιαλίων τοῦ Παλατίου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῶν ὀφφικίων τῆς μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας); (b) 'Extracts from a chronicle on the antiquities of Constantinople' (παρεκβολαὶ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου περὶ τῶν πατρίων τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως). A work of the same kind, though much less extensive than that which Constantine VI. committed to Theodosius, was intrusted by Michael VII. Ducas, towards the end of the eleventh century, to a monk of Constantinople, JOANNES XIPHILINUS of Trapezus, the nephew of the patriarch of the same name. This was an abridgment of Dion Cassius, in separate sections, each containing the reign of an emperor. The part of the original embraced in this epitome, extends from the thirty-sixth to the eightieth book.¹ This epitome of Xiphilinus is not classed with the body of Byzantine historians.

§ 12. While the secular historians were thus active in their voluminous labours, the annals of the Church also formed a favourite subject with the literary men of Byzantium. After

¹ See above, chapter LV. § 4; Niebuhr's *Lectures on the History of Rome*, I. p. 75.

Eusebius, this department was cultivated with unequal success by EPIPHANIUS, PHILOSTORGUS, PHILIP of SIDÉ, HESYCHIUS of JERUSALEM, and GELASIUS of CYZICUS, who wrote in the fourth and fifth centuries. The writings, however, of these historians are either lost or but little known. The only Byzantine writers on the history of the Church who can take rank with Eusebius, are the three following, who treated of nearly the same important period.

SOCRATES, commonly known as the SCHOLASTICUS, or 'advocate,' was born at Constantinople,¹ about A.D. 379,² and received a part, at least, of his education under Helladius and Ammonius of Alexandria. He has left us an 'ecclesiastical history' (ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία), in seven books, written in a simple style, and embracing the period from 306 to 439.³ The following is the arrangement of the books:—I. From 306 to 337. II. From 337 to 360. III. From 360 to 364. IV. From 364 to 378. V. From 379 to 395. VI. From 395 to 408. VII. From 408 to 439.

The 'ecclesiastical history' of HERMEIAS SALAMANES SOZOMENUS,⁴ commonly known as SOZOMEN, was nearly contemporary and coextensive with that of Socrates,⁵ whom Sozomen is supposed to have copied, as far at least as the plan of his work is concerned. It extends as we now have it, from 324⁶ to 415,⁷ but was designed to reach the year 439.⁸ It is divided into nine books, and is generally superior to the work of Socrates in elegance of style, though it often exhibits puerilities which the other historian had avoided. Sozomen was born at Bethel, near Gaza, in Palestine, and spent most of his early years in the Holy Land, to which he makes familiar reference in several parts of his book.

¹ *H. E.* V. 24: ἐν ᾗ ἐτέχθη καὶ ἀνετράφη.

² He speaks of the events of A.D. 395—408 as τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡλικίας (*H. E.* VI. p. 299) and had conversed with a Novatian who remembered the council of Nice (*H. E.* I. 13). He was κομιδῇ νέος when he was a pupil of Ammonius and Helladius (*H. E.* V. 16), probably soon after they fled from Alexandria to Constantinople, in A.D. 389.

³ Socrates, *H. E.* VII. 48.

⁴ Photius, *Cod.* XXX.

⁵ He dedicated his work to Theodosius II., in A.D. 439, the seventeenth year of that emperor's reign, but was writing after A.D. 443: Clinton, *F. R.* I. p. 629.

⁶ *Proem.* I. p. 397 A.

⁷ IX. 17.

⁸ *Proem.* u.s.

THEODORETUS, or, as his name is sometimes written, THEODORITUS, was born at Antioch, about the year 393, and was a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of Chrysostom. He was bishop of Cyrus, or Cyrrhus,¹ in Syria, in 423, and was condemned as a heretic in 449, by the council of Ephesus, but restored by the council of Chalcedon in 451, and died about 458. Besides a number of expository works, Theodoret left an 'ecclesiastical history,' in five books, intended as a continuation of Eusebius, and extending from 325 to 429.² Corresponding thus in general scope with the works of Socrates and Sozomen, the history of Theodoret is distinguished from them by its wider range and more comprehensive learning. The three histories just mentioned were continued by several writers. THEODORUS ANAGNOSTES,³ in the reign of Justinian, published an abridgment of his three predecessors, with the title, 'extract from the ecclesiastical histories' (ἐκλογὴ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστοριῶν), and continued them from 439, down to the reign of Justin. The histories of Socrates and Theodoret were also carried down to the year 593, by EVAGRIUS of Epiphaneia, in Syria;⁴ and, in the fourteenth century, a compiler named NICEPHORUS XANTHOPULUS, the son of Callistus, wrote an ecclesiastical history in eighteen books, which is partly compiled from the works which have been mentioned, and which, by the aid of materials derived from other sources, carries down the records of the Church to the year 610. There are traces of a continuation of this book, perhaps by some different writer, in five additional books, reaching to the year 911.

§ 13. The only other authors of the Byzantine school, whom it seems necessary to mention specifically, are the writers on natural history and medicine.

The former are rather numerous than eminent. MICHAEL PSELLUS the elder, a pupil of Photius, who flourished in the middle of the ninth century, wrote on minerals (περὶ λίθων δυνάμεων). CASSIANUS BASSUS, who lived in the time of

¹ Nicephorus, *H. E.* XIV. 53 : Θεοδώρητος τῆς Κυρεστῶν ἐκκλησίας ἱερατείας.

² This epoch was the year of the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia (Theodoret, *H. E.* V. 39), and the year before the death of Augustine.

³ Suidas, s.v. Nicephorus, *H. E.* I. 1, p. 35.

⁴ He was born about A.D. 535 ; Clinton, *F. R.* I. p. 773 ; cf. pp. 777, 9.

Constantine VI., Porphyrogenitus, compiled, by that emperor's orders, a number of extracts on subjects connected with farming and natural history, under the title Γεωπονικά. Chemistry, which was much studied at Constantinople, especially with reference to the fruitless attempt to manufacture gold, found representatives in STEPHEN of ALEXANDRIA, who wrote about 'gold-making,' (περὶ χρυσοποιΐας) in the seventh century, and in MICHAEL CONSTANTINE PSELLUS, the younger, born in 1020, who, besides writing on many other subjects, has left us several treatises on the same 'divine and mystical art.'

The medical writers were chiefly of the school of Galen. Among these ORIBASIIUS of Sardis, a contemporary of Julian, occupies a prominent place as a laborious commentator and compiler. Similar labours were undertaken by ÆTIUS of Amida in the sixth century. In the reign of Justinian, ALEXANDER of TRALLES, brother of the architect Anthemius, who built the Sancta Sophia, wrote twelve books 'on Therapeutics,' (βιβλίον θεραπευτικόν). In the seventh century PAUL of ÆGINA laid the foundations of obstetrical science and wrote a valuable treatise in seven books, called 'on the art of medicine,' which has become well known in a careful English translation.¹ In the same century THEOPHILUS PROTOSPATHARIUS appeared as a commentator on Hippocrates and Galen, and as the author or compiler of several useful treatises. Other and later writers on medical subjects scarcely deserve to be mentioned in a general history of Greek literature.

§ 14. The reader has thus been enabled to survey the entire history of Greek literature, from its obscure and almost mythical beginnings, when it was represented only by the rude songs of husbandmen, by the simple hymns of the early altar service and of the joyous or melancholy incidents of social life, or at best by the epic rhapsodies of the wandering minstrel, down to the

¹ 'The medical works of Paulus Ægineta translated into English, with a copious commentary containing a comprehensive view of the knowledge possessed by the Greeks, Romans, and Arabians, on all subjects connected with medicine and surgery, by Francis Adams, London, 1834.' The same scholar has subsequently published a translation of the genuine works of Hippocrates with a valuable introduction, which, we regret to say, was not known to us when the forty-fourth chapter of this work was sent to the printer.

time when Greek books were printed with movable types, and when those, with whom the language was still vernacular, had even surrendered to the scholars of the north and west their last useful labour of interpreting the works of their forefathers. This general history will be useful to the student in proportion as he understands its chain of connexion. Those, to whom it is merely a succession of isolated notices, will derive but little interest or profit from it. Nor will it be sufficient that the student should consider it merely according to the three principal heads into which it has been divided, although there is no better arrangement of Greek literary history than that of the præ-Athenian, Athenian, and post-Alexandrian epochs, according to which it has been treated in this work. If any one is really desirous of entering on a study of the Greek authors, with a competent knowledge of the causes which explain the phenomena of literary productiveness among the Greeks at any particular epoch, he must direct his attention to the gradual development of the facts which have been presented to him in this history. He will have to bear in mind that the earliest exhibitions of literary composition in ancient Greece were confined to certain forms of lyric and epic poetry. From these two, separately or in combination, all the subsequent manifestations of Hellenic genius were legitimately derived. The glorious creations of the Greek drama were a juxtaposition of the lyric and epic elements. The epic rhapsody paved the way for the first beginnings of prose composition, which are always contemporary with the establishment of the art of writing, and with the introduction of generally accessible writing materials. The didactic poetry of Hesiod and others found its representative in the unadorned prose of the earliest philosophers; and the parchment, on which Pherecydes wrote and which was sufficiently marvellous to occasion a legend about him, shows that the heroic narratives of the Homeric school had produced an equally early substitute in the Ionic histories of the old logographers. But prose became most important when it became Attic, and the first period of Attic prose—that of Pericles, Antiphon, and Thucydides—was introduced, as we have seen, by two parallel, but, in themselves, very different causes—Athenian politics and Sicilian sophistry. From the former, arose political oratory and

political history ; from the latter, an artificially cultivated, self-conscious, and professional rhetoric, which was not without its influence on the dramatic, lyric, and even epic poetry of the day. The topics of the political orator and the art of the rhetorical sophist were combined in Lysias, Isæus, and Isocrates, and the middle or mixed style of prose, which was introduced by Thrasyarchus, and elaborated by Isocrates, was brought to its greatest perfection in the dialogues, in which Plato set forth his own speculations by a dramatic imitation of the conversations of Socrates. The technical diction of Aristotle was peculiar to himself and the subjects of which he treated, and we have but few specimens of his more ornate style, in which he approached very closely to his master Plato. By a diligent study of Thucydides, by the lessons and example of Isæus, and by his own genius, Demosthenes brought the political oratory of Athens to its culminating point ; and the downfall of Athenian freedom was illustrated by no great orators, except the brilliant and voluble Demades and the ornate Demetrius of Phalerum, who represented the opposite extremes of improvised fluency and scholastic preparation. At this time history became purely rhetorical, and Ephorus and Theopompus were legitimate products of the teaching of Isocrates. The foundation of the collegiate institutions and libraries of Alexandria tended more and more to substitute book-learning for original genius, and to train commentators rather than authors. In poetry no less than in prose, in science no less than in history, the written lore of former times was made the basis of literary labours, rather than the imagination of the poet or the inductive speculations of the philosopher. A new epoch began when Polybius, discarding the rhetorical ornaments and book-learning of his immediate predecessors, undertook to treat history and geography on the principles of the Stoics, and on the foundations of personal experience : and we have seen that for many years his pragmatic history was the model for writers on similar subjects, even when they disparaged his style. Rhetoric, however, still kept its ground, and found an important ally in grammar. Both together gained a new encouragement from the domestication of Greek literature at Rome ; and in the second century of our era, a host of sophists, more numerous than those of the fourth

century before Christ, had established themselves as the ruling class in the republic of letters. At the same period, however, oriental influences had begun to operate on the speculations of the learned Greeks; and neither the solemn conscientiousness of the later Stoics, nor the honest and free-spoken humour of Lucian, could effectually counteract the superstitious enthusiasm or deliberate and audacious imposture, which found imperial encouragement from Julia Domna at the beginning of the third century, and from Julian in the middle of the fourth. The concurrence of these causes—the predominance of the sophistical schools, and the Oriental bias of Neo-Platonism, had effected the overthrow of the old classical fabric of literature. And when Christianity became predominant, and formally relinquished that union with heathen culture, for which Clement of Alexandria had so earnestly contended, when the schools of Athens were closed, and even the last echoes of the old voices had died away in the romance of Heliodorus or the epos of Nonnus, there was nothing left of Greek literature during the remaining eight centuries of its vernacular cultivation, except the cadaverous forms and galvanic vitality of the Byzantine age.

These are the salient points in the general picture now laid before the classical student. With this view of the chain of causes and consequences, which connected the origin and growth of Greek literature with its ulterior developments and final decadence and extinction, he will be better able to direct his reading according to the objects which he proposes to attain. If he wishes merely to cull the choicest flowers in the garden of the Graces, he will not extend his studies beyond the great epic, lyric, and dramatic poets, the noble historians and orators, and the lofty philosophers of the first two periods; but he will have an opportunity of learning from these pages, that Greek literature did not exhaust its attractions in the classical ages, that Alexandria and Romanized Greece produced many works which are calculated to excite and repay a liberal curiosity, and that his appreciation of the best models of Hellenic style will be increased, and perhaps his comprehension of their meaning will be extended by a perusal in the original of some of those later writers, whose names are known to many professed Greek scholars only from their appearance in marginal references.

Considering the influence which Greek literature has produced, both directly and indirectly, on that of modern Europe, and the unapproachable excellence of its best productions as models of style and as materials for reflexion, it seems most desirable that every one, who becomes acquainted with any portion of it, should know what it was as a whole, and how, as a whole, it has become the inalienable heirloom of the highest civilization. It will be an evil day for the continued progress of intellectual refinement, if those, who undertake to guide the tastes and regulate the opinions of their generation, should ever persuade themselves, and act on the persuasion, that the modern writer of books may safely repudiate all cognizance of the literature of Greece. A history of ancient literature proves, if it proves anything, that a national cultivation of the intellect cannot be improvised; that it is only under a peculiar combination of circumstances that the thoughts, which are more or less common to all ages and countries, complete themselves in an adequate expression at some particular time and in some particular district. Literature does not admit of perpetual recommencements and reproductions. When perfection has been attained in any branch of book-making, subsequent generations and other nations are obliged to abstain from fruitless rivalry, and to work according to the established model and exemplar. It is not to be supposed that the human brain is constituted now in a manner differing essentially from its characteristics in the days of Homer or of Sophocles or Plato; but it is not the less true than in the ages which followed those normal writers, we have not found even a cognate genius which could do more than imitate the *Iliad*, or resume the stately march of the Attic cothurnus, or reawaken the echoes of the Academy. Independently, however, of the singular and unrivalled abilities of the best Greek writers, and the peculiar condition of the Greek language, which almost stands alone as combining redundance of inflexion with the logical exactness of syntax, the long period over which the literature extends, and the wide area over which the language was spread by the conquests of Alexander, have given to both of them an importance in universal history, which no other books and no other idiom can claim. As long as the thoughts of the present are linked to the recollections of the

past, it will be impossible for civilized and educated man to ignore altogether the literary results of Hellenic art and genius. And if ever a time should come when the history of bygone ages has become a blank, and when mankind, having toiled to the summits of science and art, are contented to begin afresh from the bottom; if some future generation and some distant land shall inherit or attain to the material advantages of civilization, without any thought or care for the traditions of mental culture, and in total unacquaintance with the monuments and records of ancient life, then, and not till then, will Greek literature lose all its interest and value. But if this state of things should ever occur, that age and nation will have returned to the childhood of intellectual development; and, having relinquished a rich inheritance of thought and language, will have nothing left but the uncertain prospect of gradually recovering their lost advantages.

Such are some of the benefits which may be expected from a connected study of the literary history of ancient Greece. And these results are greatly enhanced by the fact that this ancient literature is classical rather than sacred; that it has established itself in the schools without lending itself as a handmaid to sacerdotal despotism; that it has connected itself inalienably with the higher civilization of Europe, without inviting or sanctioning any superstitious reverence towards itself. One at least of the Semitic languages, and the literature which is its representative, have invested themselves with a sacred character which challenges a devout and slavish homage, and rebukes the advances of critical investigation. Much the same has been, in their own country, the fate of the language and literature of ancient India. But the literature of Greece, and its product and nursling, the literature of Rome, have been accepted by modern Europe as supplying the best models of taste and refinement, the text-books of poetry and rhetoric, and the materials of grammar and criticism, without any implication of superhuman attributes to the writers. The literary history of these nations, especially that of Greece, is like the examination of a work of art from the chisel of Phidias or Praxiteles. However much the artistic critic may be convinced that he has before him a production of

unsurpassed excellence, he never for a moment admits the supposition that it fell from heaven, like the Artemis of Ephesus. He regards it as an effort of human genius; and while his admiration of its beauty would always lead him to shield it from the ignorant violence of an iconoclast, his knowledge of the circumstances, which rendered such a work not only a natural but even a necessary phenomenon, renders it impossible that he should ever become an idolater. So it is with the student who is led to examine the gradual development of some branch of classical literature. And he is not only persuaded that, however wonderful, it is still only human, but his mind is prepared, unless he is the slave of some deep-rooted prejudice, to bring the same chastened judgment to an estimation of the claims which have been advanced on behalf of other manifestations of literary activity. This was the effect of a revived classical spirit in the fifteenth century, and it is the natural consequence whenever an independent mind is fortified and sustained by liberal cultivation. We permit ourselves to hope that the review, which we have now brought to a close, may contribute in some measure towards this important result, and that the intelligent reader, who has traced the literature of Greece through its various phases of growth and decay, will be led to regard all other written utterances of the past with a well-regulated judgment, removed equally from the vicious extremes of irrational enthusiasm and irreverent depreciation.

CHRONOLOGY
OF
GREEK LITERATURE.

CHRONOLOGY

OF

GREEK LITERATURE.

Collateral notices are printed in Italics. The numbers added in brackets refer to the chapters and sections of the history.

FIRST PERIOD.

B.C.	OLYMP.	
1400—1200		<i>Age of the Vêdas.</i>
1184		<i>Destruction of Troy.</i>
1104		<i>Dorian Immigration.</i>
1102		Birth of Homer, according to the Pseudo-Herodotus.
1095		<i>Samuel fl.</i>
		<i>Beginnings of Jewish Literature.</i>
1070		<i>Saul King of Israel.</i>
1048		<i>David King.</i>
1008		<i>Solomon King.</i>
1004		<i>The Building of the Temple commences.</i>
997		<i>Dedication of the Temple.</i>
		<i>Jewish Literature flourishes.</i>
966		Birth of Homer, according to Velleius Paterculus (V.)
940—927		Date of the <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> , according to Clinton, <i>F. H. I.</i> p. 146.
		Creophylus of Samos (IX. § 3).
		Stasinus of Cyprus (VI. § 4).
		<i>Prophecies of Joel.</i>
924		<i>Birth of Lycurgus.</i>
850		Hesiod (VIII.).
		Cecrops.
840		<i>Death of Lycurgus.</i>
822—814		<i>Foundation of Carthage.</i>
812		<i>Foundation of Rhegium.</i>
767	I, I.	Arctinus (VI. § 2).

B.C.	OLYMP.	
776	1, 1	Agius of Trœzen (§ 5).
765	3, 4	Cinæthon (IX. § 2).
761	4, 4	Eumelus of Corinth (<i>ibid.</i>)
759, 8	5, 2, 3	<i>Foundation of Naxos and Syracuse.</i>
756—750	6, 7, 3	<i>Colonies of the Milesians.</i>
753	6, 4	<i>Rome founded.</i>
		<i>Chersiphron and Rhoecus.</i>
		Antimachus of Teos.
747	8, 2	<i>First appearance of Isaiah.</i>
743—723	9, 2—14, 2	<i>First Messenian War.</i>
730	12, 3	<i>Foundation of Leontium and Catana.</i>
710	17, 3	<i>Foundation of Croton.</i>
708	18	<i>Foundation of Tarentum and Corcyra.</i>
		Lesches (VI. § 3).
		<i>Bularchus, the first polychrome Painter.</i>
700		<i>Sanscrit epic poetry flourishes.</i>
691	22, 2	<i>Glaucus of Chios.</i>
690	22, 3	<i>Foundation of Gela.</i>
		Terpander (XII. § 2).
688	23, 1	Archilochus (XI. § 6).
685—668	23, 4—28, 1	<i>Second Messenian War.</i>
683	24, 2	Tyrtæus (X. § 5).
678	25, 3	Callinus (X. § 4).
671	27, 2	Alcman (XIV. § 2).
		Polymnestus (XII. § 11).
		Thaletas (XII. § 9).
664	29, 1	Simonides of Amorgus (XI. § 11).
662	29, 3	<i>Zaleucus, Charondas.</i>
		Asius of Samos (IX. 2).
659	30, 2	Epimenides born (XVI. § 4).
657	30, 4	<i>Byzantium founded.</i>
651	32, 2	Pittacus, Peisander (IX. § 3).
639	35, 2	Thales born (XVII. § 4).
631	37, 2	<i>Cyrene founded.</i>
629	37, 4	<i>Sinope.</i>
		Mimnermus (X. § 9).
626	38, 3	<i>Call of Jeremiah.</i>
625—585	38, 4—48, 4	<i>Periander.</i>
		Arion (XIV. § 7).
		Chersias of Orchomenus (IX. § 2).
620	40, 1	<i>Draco.</i>
611	42, 3	Sappho (XIII. § 6).
		Alcæus (<i>ib.</i> § 2).
		Stesichorus (XIV. § 4).
605	43, 4	<i>The prophet Habakkuk.</i>

B. C.	OLYMP.	
600	45, 1	<i>Foundation of Massilia.</i>
594	46, 3	Solon (X. § 11).
594	46, 3	Echembrotus (X. § 2).
592	47, 1	<i>Ezekiel.</i>
586	48, 3	Sacadas (XII. § 11).
582	49, 3	<i>Agrigentum founded.</i>
578	50, 3	Susarion (XXVII. § 3).
572	52, 1	<i>War of Pisa and Elis.</i>
		Æsopus (XI. § 16).
566	53, 3	Eugammon of Cyrene (VI. § 6).
560	55, 1	<i>Peisistratus.</i>
559	55, 2	<i>Heraclea on the Euxine.</i>
		Anacreon (XIII. § 11).
		Prodicus of Phocæa.
556	56, 1	Birth of Simonides of Ceos (XIV. § 10).
		Diodorus of Erythræ.
		Hegesinus.
549	57, 4	<i>Death of Phalaris.</i>
		Aristeas (XVI. § 4).
548	58, 1	Anaximenes (XVII. § 6).
547	58, 2	Anaximander æt. 64 (<i>ib.</i> § 5).
		Hipponax (XI. § 13).
543	59, 2	<i>Overthrow of the Lydian Empire.</i>
		<i>Death of Buddha.</i>
		Pherecydes of Syros (XVI. § 4; XVIII. § 4).
		Theognis (X. § 13).
		Phocylides.
540	60, 1	Pythagoras (XVII. § 14).
		Ibycus (XIV. § 8).
538	60, 3	Xenophanes (X. § 16).
		<i>Return of the Jews under Zerubbabel.</i>
535	61, 2	Thespis (XXI. § 6).
532	62, 1	<i>Polycrates of Samos.</i>
		Pythagoras fl.
529	62, 4	<i>Death of Cyrus.</i>
527	63, 2	<i>Death of Peisistratus.</i>
		Theagenes.
525	63, 4	Birth of Æschylus (XXIII. § 1).
523	64, 2	Chœrilus comes forward as a dramatist (XXI. § 8).
		<i>Death of Polycrates.</i>
522	64, 3	Birth of Pindar (XV. § 1).
		Cadmus? (XVIII. § 3).
521	64, 4	<i>Death of Cambyses.</i>

B. C.	OLYMP.	
520	65, 1	Hecataeus (XVIII. § 4). Dionysius of Miletus? (XVIII. § 8). Melanippides the elder.
520	65, 1	Onomacritus. <i>Ageladas.</i>
519	65, 2	Birth of Cratinus? (XXVII. § 4).
515	66, 2	Birth of Parmenides (XVII. § 11).
514	66, 3	<i>Death of Hipparchus.</i> Antiochus of Syracuse. Herpys? <i>Callon. Entelidas. Gitiadas.</i>
511	67, 2	Phrynichus the tragedian fl. (XXI. § 7).
510	67, 3	<i>Expulsion of the Peisistratidæ.</i> Telesilla fl.
505	68, 4	Heracleitus fl. (XVII. § 7).
504	69, 1	Charon (XVIII. § 6). Parmenides (XVII. § 11). Lasus (XIV. § 14).
503	69, 2	Hecataeus gives advice to the Ionians (XVIII. § 4).
501	69, 4	<i>Naxian War.</i> Hecataeus fl. (XVII. § 4).
500	70, 1	Birth of Anaxagoras (XVII. § 8). Epicharmus fl.
499	70, 2	<i>Ionian War.</i> Æschylus (XXIII.). Pratinas (XXI. § 9).
498	70, 3	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> X. Scylax of Caryanda? (L. § 3). Acusilaus (XVIII. § 3).
496	71, 1	Birth of Hellanicus (XVIII. § 7).
495	71, 2	Birth of Sophocles (XXIV. § 1).
494	71, 3	<i>Capture of Miletus.</i> Phrynichus (XXI. § 7).
490	72, 3	<i>Battle of Marathon.</i> Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> VI. Panyasis (XXX. § 6). Simonides of Ceos (XIV. § 11). Corinna (XV. § 1). Myrtis (<i>ib.</i>). Leucippus. Ocellus?
488	73, 1	Pindar, <i>Ol.</i> IX.
484	74, 1	Birth of Herodotus (XIX. § 1). First prize of Æschylus.

SECOND PERIOD.

B.C.	OLYMP.	
480	75, 1	<i>Second Persian War.</i> Anaxagoras. Pherecydes, the historian (XVIII. § 5). Diogenes of Apollonia (XVII. § 9). Chionides. Magnes (XXVII. § 3). Birth of Euripides (XXV. § 1). Birth of Antiphon.
479	75, 2	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> III.
478	75, 3	Epicharmus fl. (XXIX. § 5).
477	75, 4	<i>Phænissæ</i> of Phrynichus (XXI. § 7).
476	76, 1	<i>Naval Victory of Hiero.</i>
474	76, 3	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> VII., XI., IX.
472	77, 1	Death of Pythagoras? Æschylus, <i>Persæ</i> . Pindar, <i>Ol.</i> II., XII.
471	77, 2	Timocreon of Rhodes (XIV. § 14).
470	77, 3	Birth of Thucydides (XXXIV. § 1). Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> I.
469—429	77, 4—87, 4	<i>Administration of Pericles.</i>
468	78, 1	Birth of Socrates (XXXVII. § 1). First prize of Sophocles.
467	78, 2	Birth of Andocides. Death of Simonides.
466	78, 3	Diagoras of Melos fl. (XXX. § 2). Corax, the rhetorician (XXXII. § 3).
464	79, 1	Xanthus, the Lydian fl. (XVIII. § 8). Zeno, of Elea (XVII. § 12). Pindar, <i>Ol.</i> XIII.
462	79, 3	Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> IV., V. Tisias (XXXII. § 4).
460	80, 1	Democritus, Hippocrates born (XLIV. § 1). Pindar, <i>Ol.</i> VIII. Archelaus.
458	80, 3	Gorgias (XXXII. § 2). Lysias born (XXXV. § 1). Æschylus, <i>Oresteæ</i> . Neophron of Sicyon? (XXVI. § 2).
457	80, 4	Death of Panyasis (XXX. § 6).
456	81, 1	Empedocles (XVII. § 13). Death of Æschylus.

B. C.	OLYMP.	
455	81, 2	Euripides, <i>Peliades</i> (XXV. § 1). Aristarchus of Tegea (XXVI. § 2).
452	82, 1	Aristophanes born (XXVIII. § 1).
451	82, 2	Ion of Chios (XXVI. § 2, XXX. § 2). Dionysius of Miletus? (XVIII. § 8).
450	82, 3	Crates (XXVII. § 4, XXIX. § 3). Bacchylides (XIV. § 13). Praxilla.
448	83, 1	Cratinus, <i>Archilochi</i> . Carcinus? (XXVI. § 2).
446	83, 3	<i>Formation of the Jewish Canon of Sacred Books commences.</i> Achæus (XXVI. § 2). Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> VIII. Melissus fl. (XVII. § 12). Protagoras fl. (XXXII. § 1). Damastes.
443	84, 2	Herodicus (XLIV. § 2). Herodotus and Lysias go to Thurii (XIX. § 1, XXXV. § 1). Birth of Xenophon.
440	85, 1	<i>Pheidias. Alcamenes. Agoracritus. Panceus.</i> <i>Samian War.</i> Sophocles, <i>Antigone</i> . Melissus defeats the Athenians (XVII. § 12). Sophocles and Herodotus meet at Samos (XXIV. § 2). Comedy prohibited.
439	85, 2	Death of Pindar.
438	85, 3	<i>Propylæa at Athens and Olympian Zeus.</i> Euripides, <i>Alcestis</i> .
436	86, 1	Prohibition of Comedy repealed. Isocrates born (XXXVI. § 1).
435	86, 2	Prodicus (XXXII. § 2). Hippias (<i>ibid.</i>). Thrasymachus (<i>ibid.</i>). Meton.
		Hermippus (XXVII. § 4). Telecleides (<i>ibid.</i>). Phrynichus, Comedian (<i>ibid.</i>). <i>Myron. Polycletus.</i>
431	87, 2	<i>Peloponnesian War.</i> Hippocrates fl. (XLIV. § 1).

B. C.	OLYMP.	
431	87, 2	Funeral Oration of Pericles (XXXI. § 3). Euripides, <i>Medea</i> . Eupolis (XXVII. § 4, XXIX. § 2).
430	87, 3	<i>Plague at Athens</i> .
429	87, 4	Birth of Plato (XXXIX. § 1). <i>Death of Pericles</i> .
428	88, 1	Death of Anaxagoras. Euripides, <i>Hippolytus</i> . <i>Administration of Cleon</i> . Sophron fl.
427	88, 2	Gorgias at Athens (XXXII. § 2). Aristophanes, <i>Dædaleis</i> . Plato, the Comedian (XXVII. § 4).
426	88, 3	Aristophanes, <i>Babylonians</i> . Hermippus, <i>Phormophori</i> .
425	88, 4	Aristophanes, <i>Acharnians</i> . Melanippides, the younger (XXX. § 2). Cinesias (<i>ibid.</i>). Phrynis (<i>ibid.</i>). Telestes (<i>ibid.</i>).
424	89, 1	<i>Delium</i> . Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i> .
423	89, 2	Thucydides banished (XXXIV. § 1). Death of Cratinus (XXVII. § 4, XXIX. § 1). Aristophanes, <i>Clouds</i> , first Edition. History of Antiochus terminates (XLIII. § 4).
422	89, 3	<i>Death of Cleon</i> . Aristophanes, <i>Wasps</i> ; <i>Clouds</i> , second Edition. Eupolis, <i>Maricas</i> ; <i>Flatterers</i> .
420	90, 1	Pherecrates, <i>Savages</i> . Eupolis, <i>Autolycus</i> , Ἀστυλάτοι.
419	90, 2	Aristophanes, <i>Peace</i> .
416	91, 1	Agathon fl. (XXVI. § 3). Socrates fl.
415	91, 2	<i>Expedition to Sicily</i> . Euripides, <i>Troades</i> . Xenocles fl. (XXVI. § 2). Archippus, comedian, gains the prize.
414	91, 3	Polus (XXXII. § 5). Alcidamas (<i>ibid.</i>).
414	91, 3	Aristophanes, <i>Amphiaraus</i> ; <i>Birds</i> .
413	91, 4	Hegemon, <i>Gigantomachia</i> .

B.C.	OLYMP.	
413	91, 4	<i>Disaster in Sicily.</i>
412	92, 1	Euripides, <i>Andromeda</i> . Antiphon (XXXIII. § 1). Euenus (XXX. § 5). Critias (<i>ibid.</i>). <i>Revolt of Lesbos, Chios, and Erythræ.</i>
411	92, 2	Aristophanes, <i>Lysistrata</i> ; <i>Thesmophoriazusæ</i> . Death of Antiphon (XXXIII. § 1).
409	92, 4	Sophocles, <i>Philoctetes</i> .
408	93, 1	Euripides, <i>Orestes</i> . Aristophanes, <i>Plutus I</i> .
407	93, 2	Births of Antiphanes and Ephorus (XLIII. § 2).
406	93, 3	<i>Battle of Arginusæ</i> . Death of Euripides. Philistus fl. (XLIII. § 5).
405	95, 4	Death of Sophocles. <i>Ægospotami</i> . Aristophanes, <i>Frogs</i> . Iophon (XXVI. § 5). Chœrilus of Samos (XXX. § 6). Antimachus (XXX. § 5). Cratippus. Andocides (XXXIII. § 6).
404	94, 1	<i>The Thirty Tyrants</i> .
403	94, 2	Plato begins to write dialogues.
401	94, 4	Xenophon in Asia (XXXVIII. § 1). Ctesias fl. (XXXVIII. § 9). Sophocles, <i>Œdipus Coloneus</i> .
400	95, 1	Andocides, <i>on the mysteries</i> (XXXIII. § 6).
399	95, 2	Death of Socrates (XXXVII. § 1). Plato leaves Athens (XXXIX. § 2). Cephalus. Aristophon. Archytas. Timæus.
398	95, 3	Eucleides of Megara (XXXVII. § 4). Æschines. Phædo. Antisthenes (XXXVII. § 5). Aristippus (XXXVII. § 6).
397	95, 4	Xenophon fl. Timotheus. Philoxenus. Telestes.
396	96, 1	Sophocles the Younger (XXV. § 5). Meletus (XXVI. § 4).

B.C.	OLYMP.	
396	96, 1	Strattis (XXVII. § 4). <i>Zeuxis. Parrhasius. Timanthes.</i> <i>Pauson. Scopas.</i>
395	96, 2	Plato returns to Athens (XXXIX. § 1). Battle of Corinth.
394	96, 3	<i>Battle of Cnidus. Coronea.</i> Lysias, <i>for Mantitheus.</i> Plato, <i>Gorgias; Republic</i> , 1st Edition (XXXIX. § 3).
392	97, 1	Aristophanes, <i>Ecclesiazusæ.</i>
391	97, 2	Andocides, <i>on the peace</i> (XXXIII. § 6).
390	97, 3	Theætetus fl.
389	97, 4	Plato's first visit to Sicily (XXXIX. § 2). Anniceris (XXXVII. § 6). Birth of Æschines (XLII. § 5).
388	98, 1	Aristophanes, <i>Plutus II.</i>
387	98, 2	<i>Peace of Antalcidas.</i> Cleidemus the Atthidist (XLIII. § 6).
386	98, 3	Theopompus, the last poet of the old comedy. Plato's <i>Phædrus</i> ? (XXXIX. § 6).
384	99, 1	Lysias, <i>against Theomnestus.</i> Birth of Aristotle (XL. § 1).
383	99, 2	Antiphanes begins to exhibit.
382	99, 3	Birth of Demosthenes (XLI. § 1).
380	100, 1	Isocrates, <i>Panegyricus.</i> Chæremon (XXVI. § 6). Alexis. Araros. Eubulus. Anaxandrides. Deinon.
379	100, 2	<i>The Cadmea recovered.</i>
378	100, 3	Death of Lysias. Birth of Theopompus (XLIII. § 3).
374	101, 3	Isocrates, <i>Plataicus.</i>
371	102, 2	<i>Battle of Leuctra.</i>
368	103, 1	Aphareus the tragedian. <i>Death of Dionysius the Elder.</i>
367	103, 2	Plato's second visit to Sicily (XXXIX. § 2). Aristotle comes to Athens (XL. § 1). <i>Lysippus. Euphranor. Nicias.</i> <i>Praxiteles.</i>
366	103, 3	Speech of Callistratus about Oropus.
364	104, 1	Isæus, <i>Philoctemon.</i> Demosthenes, <i>against Aphobus.</i> Polyzelus.
362	104, 3	Battle of Mantinea.

B. C.	OLYMP.	
362	104, 3	Plato's third visit to Sicily (XXXIX. § 2).
361	104, 4	Birth of Deinarchus (XLII. § 6).
359	105, 2	<i>Accession of Philip.</i> Death of Xenophon?
357	105, 4	Death of Hippocrates? (XLIV. § 1.) Death of Timotheus of Miletus (XXX. § 2).
356	106, 1	Death of Philistus (XLIII. § 5). Alexis the comic poet. <i>Birth of Alexander.</i>
354	106, 3	Demosthenes, <i>on the Symmoriae</i> . Aristippus the younger.
353	106, 4	Isocrates, <i>Areopagiticus</i> ; <i>Antidosis</i> .
352	107, 1	Theodectes fl. (XXVI. § 7. XL. § 5). <i>Apelles. Aristeides. Leochares.</i> Theopompus gains the prize against Isocrates.
351	107, 2	Demosthenes, <i>for the Rhodians</i> .
350	107, 3	Demosthenes, <i>against Bæotus</i> ; <i>for Phormio</i> .
349	107, 4	Demosthenes, <i>Olynthiac orations</i> .
348	108, 1	Demosthenes, <i>against Meidias</i> (XLIII. § 6). Theopompus fl. Phanodemus. Androtion. Pytheas of Massilia.
347	108, 2	Death of Plato (XXXIX. § 2). Speusippus (XLVII. § 3). Aristotle and Xenocrates go to Atarneus (XL. § 1).
345	108, 4	Æschines, <i>against Timarchus</i> .
344	109, 1	Demosthenes, <i>Philippic II</i> . <i>Expedition of Timoleon</i> .
343	109, 2	Aristotle goes to Macedon (XL. § 1). Demosthenes and Æschines, <i>on the</i> <i>Embassy</i> . Hegesippus.
342	109, 3	Birth of Menander. Birth of Epicurus (XLVII. § 6). Diyllus. Anaxarchus.
340	110, 1	Eubulides (XXXVII. § 4).
338	110, 3	<i>Battle of Chæroneæ</i> . Death of Isocrates.
337	110, 4	<i>Death of Timoleon</i> . Lycurgus, <i>against Lysicles and Autolycus</i> .
336	111, 1	<i>Death of Philip.</i>

B.C.	OLYMP.	
335	III, 2	<i>Thebes destroyed.</i>
334	III, 3	Diogenes the Cynic (XXXVII. § 5). <i>Alexander invades Asia.</i> Aristotle returns to Athens (XL. § 1). Hypereides, for <i>Lycophron</i> and <i>Euxenippus</i> .
333	III, 4	Death of Antiphanes. Scylax of Caryanda? (L. § 3). Anaximenes. Hecataeus of Abdera. Marsyas. Callisthenes.
332	III, 1	<i>Foundation of Alexandria.</i> Demosthenes, against <i>Phormio</i> .
331	III, 2	Lycurgus, against <i>Aristogeiton</i> .
330	III, 3	<i>Death of Darius.</i> Lycurgus, against <i>Leocrates</i> (XLII. § 3). Demosthenes and <i>Æschines</i> , on the <i>Crown</i> (XLI. § 1).
324	III, 1	Hypereides, against <i>Demosthenes</i> . Demosthenes banished (XLI. § 5).
323	III, 2	<i>Death of Alexander.</i>
322	III, 3	<i>Lamian War.</i> Deaths of Demosthenes (XLI. § 1), Aristotle (XL. § 1), and Hypereides (XLI. § 4).

THIRD PERIOD.

321	III, 4	Menander, <i>Ὀπρή</i> (XXIX. § 7). Philemon fl. (<i>ibid.</i>).
320	III, 1	<i>Ptolemy I. Soter, King of Egypt.</i> Diphilus fl. Death of Theopompus.
318	III, 3	Death of Demades. Demetrius Phalereus fl. (XLVI. § 1, XLVIII. § 1).
315	III, 2	Death of Xenocrates (XLVII. § 3).
314	III, 3	Death of <i>Æschines</i> (XLII. § 5).
306	III, 3	Demochares. Philochorus (XLIII. § 6). Demon (XLIII. § 6). Timæus (XLIX. § 1).

B. C.	OLYMP.	
306	118, 3	Hegesias of Messenia.
304	119, 1	Archedippus. Philippides. Anaxippus.
300	120, 1	Arcesilaus (XLVII. § 8). Zeno (XLVII. § 7). Pyrrhon (XLVII. § 5). Metrodorus (XLVII. § 6). Stilpo (XXXVII. § 4). Menedemus. Theophrastus (XLVII. § 4). Hegesias (XXXVII. § 6). Theodorus Atheus (<i>ibid.</i>). Euhemerus (XLVI. § 4). Diodorus Cronus (XXXVII. § 4). Philetas (XLV. § 3). Simmias. Dosiadas. Rhinton (XLV. § 8). Anyte the epigrammatic poetess? Marsyas of Pella (XLVI. § 4). Megasthenes (XLVI. § 5). Hieronymus of Cardia (XLVI. § 4). Cleitarchus (<i>ibid.</i>). Herophilus. Aristobulus of Cassandrea. Euclides of Alexandria (XLVI. § 6). <i>Prologues.</i> Aristoxenus of Tarentum (XLVII. § 4). 296 121, 1 Demetrius Phalereus in Egypt (XLVI. § 1). 290 122, 3 <i>Demetrius Poliorcetes at Athens.</i> 289 122, 4 Poseidippus. Dicæarchus (XLVII. § 4). Polemon, Crantor, and Crates the Acade- micians (XLVII. § 3). Bion the Borysthenite. 287 123, 2 Death of Theophrastus (XLVII. § 4). Birth of Archimedes (XLVI. § 6). 285 123, 4 <i>Ptolemy II. Philadelphus.</i> Zeno (XLVII. § 7). Birth of Chrysippus. 280 125, 1 Aristarchus of Samos. Conon. Berosus (XLVI. § 5).

B.C.	OLYMP.	
280	125, 1	Manetho (XLVI. § 5). Metrodorus (XLVII. § 6). Idomeneus. Duris. Strato of Lampsacus (XLVII. § 4). Aratus (XLV. § 3). Zenodotus (XLVI. § 2). Alexander the Ætolian (XLV. § 8). Timon of Phlius (XLV. § 8, XLVII. § 5). Sotades (<i>ibid.</i>). Sopater (<i>ibid.</i>). Lynceus. Colotes.
278	125, 3	Cineas in Italy (XLVIII. § 1). Homerus. Sositheus (XLV. § 5). Philiscus. Sosiphanes (XLV. § 5). Dionysides (XLV. § 5). Lycophron (XLV. § 5). Æantides (XLV. § 5). Zoilus.
276	126, 3	Birth of Eratosthenes (XLVI. § 6).
272	127, 1	<i>Death of Pyrrhus.</i> Hermesianax and Phanocles (XLV. § 3). Theocritus (XLV. § 7). Bion (<i>ibid.</i>). Moschus (<i>ibid.</i>).
270	127, 3	Deaths of Epicurus and Polemon. Ariston and Herillus (XLVII. § 7). Leonidas of Tarentum (L. § 1). Menedemus of Eretria. Lycon (XLVII. § 4).
264	129, 1	<i>First Punic War.</i> The Parian Marble.
263	129, 2	Cleanthes (XLVII. § 7).
262	129, 3	Death of Philemon.
260	130, 1	<i>Naval Victory of Duilius.</i>
256	131, 7	Callimachus, Librarian at Alexandria (XLV. § 4). Death of Timæus (XLIX. § 1).
250	132, 3	Nymphis of Heraclea. Philinus of Cos.
247	133, 2	<i>Ptolemy III. Evergetes.</i>
241	134, 4	<i>Attalus I.</i>

B.C.	OLYMP.	
241	134, 4	Death of Arcesilaus. Lacydes (XLVII. § 8).
239	135, 2	<i>Ennius</i> born. <i>Livius Andronicus</i> exhibits.
236	136, 1	Ister Callimachus (XLIII. § 6).
235	136, 2	<i>Nævius fl.</i> (L. § 1). Chrysippus fl. (XLVII. § 7). Eratosthenes (XLVII. § 6). Euphorion. Rhianus (XLV. § 6).
225	139, 2	Fabius Pictor.
222	139, 3	<i>L. Cincius Alimentus.</i> <i>Ptolemy IV. Philopator.</i>
221	139, 4	Apollonius of Perga (XLVI. § 6). Archimedes (<i>ibid.</i>)
219	140, 2	Phylarchus (XLIX. § 3). <i>Pacuvius</i> born.
218	140, 3	<i>Second Punic War.</i>
213	141, 4	Birth of Carneades (XLVII. § 8).
212	142, 1	Death of Archimedes (XLVI. § 6).
207	143, 2	<i>Battle of the Metaurus.</i> Death of Chrysippus. Zeno of Tarsus (XLVII. § 7). Birth of Polybius.
205	143, 4	<i>Ptolemy V. Epiphanes.</i> <i>Ennius</i> brought to Rome.
200	145, 1	Aristophanes of Byzantium fl. (XLVI. § 2). Philinus of Agrigentum. Chæreas. Sosilus (XLIX. § 3).
196	146, 1	Eratosthenes dies (XLVI. § 6). Apollonius Rhodius librarian (XLV. § 6).
184	149, 1	<i>Death of Plautus.</i>
181	149, 4	<i>Ptolemy VI. Philometor.</i> Jesus the Son of Sirach (LIII. § 1). Nicander (XLV. § 6). Aristobulus Judeus.
169	152, 4	<i>Ennius</i> dies.
166	153, 3	<i>Terence fl.</i>
160	155, 1	Hipparchus (XLVI. § 6). Demetrius Scepsius.
159	155, 2	Aristarchus of Samothrace (XLVI. § 2). Crates of Mallus (<i>ibid.</i>).
155	156, 2	Embassy of Carneades, Diogenes, and Critolaus.
151	157, 2	Polybius returns to Greece (XLIX. § 4).

B. C.	OLYMP.	
146	158, 3	<i>Carthage and Corinth destroyed.</i> <i>Ptolemy VII. Evergetes (Physcon).</i> Cleitomachus (XLVII. § 8). Apollodorus of Athens (XLVI. § 4). Antipater of Tarsus (XLVII. § 7).
143	159, 2	Panætius (XLVII. § 7). Poseidonius (<i>ibid.</i> LI. § 1).
138	160, 3	Antipater of Sidon (L. § 3). Dionysius the Thracian. Diodorus the Peripatetic.
122	164, 3	Death of Polybius.
121	169, 4	<i>Death of C. Gracchus.</i> Blossius of Cumæ (L. § 2). Mnesarchus.
117	165, 4	<i>Ptolemy VIII., Soter II.</i>
110	167, 3	Agatharchides (XLVIII. § 3). Charmadas.
106	168, 3	Antipater of Sidon (L. § 3).
102	169, 3	Archias comes to Rome (L. § 3). Hierocles and Meneceles (XLVIII. § 3). Artemidorus. Meleager (L. § 3).
90	172, 3	Philo the Academician (XLVII. § 8). Apollonius Molo. Demetrius (L. § 4). Hero the mechanician.
84	174, 1	The library of Apellicon brought to Rome. Tyrannion the elder.
80	175, 1	<i>Ptolemy IX. Dionysus (Auletes).</i>
79	175, 2	<i>Abdication of Sulla.</i> <i>Cicero at Athens.</i> Antiochus the Academician (XLVII. § 8). Zeno the Epicurean. Diotimus the Stoic.
74	176, 4	Scymnus of Chios? (L. § 3). Andronicus of Rhodes.
60	180, 1	Castor (LI. § 1). Hermagoras. Parthenius of Nicæa (LVIII. § 4). Philodemus (L. §§ 4, 5). Geminus. Timagenes (LI. § 1). Meleager (L. § 3).
58	180, 3	<i>Age of Vicramāditya (XLV. § 1).</i> <i>Indian Drama flourishes.</i>

B.C.	OLYMP.	
55	181, 2	Demetrius Magnes. Nicolaus of Damascus (LI. § 1). Theophanes of Lesbos (<i>ibid.</i>).
52	182, 1	<i>Cicero pro Milone.</i> <i>Death of Lucretius.</i>
51	182, 2	<i>Cleopatra.</i> Asclepiades the younger. Apollonius of Tyre. Quintus Sextius (L. § 5). <i>Death of Julius Cæsar.</i>
44	184, 1	Cratippus. Phædrus. Antipater of Tyre. Diodorus Siculus (LI. § 2). Gorgias of Athens (L. § 4). Dioscorides.
43	184, 2	Babrius (L. § 3). <i>Death of Cicero.</i>
40	185, 1	The library of Pergamus taken to Alexandria.
30	187, 3	<i>Deaths of Antony and Cleopatra.</i> Dionysius of Halicarnassus (L. § 4, LI. § 3). Cæcilius of Calacte (L. § 4). Dionysius of Charax (L. § 3). Tyrannio the younger. Didymus Chalcenterus (L. § 4). Juba (LI. § 1). Heliodorus (L. § 3).
10	192, 3	Theodorus of Gadara (L. § 4). Apollodorus of Pergamus (<i>ibid.</i>). Lesbonax. Potamon (<i>ibid.</i>). Hermagoras (XLVIII. § 3). Asinius Pollio of Tralles (XLI. § 6). Strabo (LI. § 5). Tullius Laurea. Polemon. Julius Polyænus (L. § 3). Timocrates (L. § 4).

A.D.	
14 14—41	<i>Death of Augustus.</i> <i>Tiberius to Caligula.</i> Apion. Archibius. Philippus of Thessalonica (L. § 3). Tryphon. Apollonides of Nicæa (L. § 4). Lollius Bassus (L. § 3). Pamphilus. Philo Judæus (LVI. § 2). <i>Claudius to Vitellius.</i> C. Musonius Rufus (L. § 5). Annæus Cornutus (<i>ibid.</i>). Euphrates (<i>ibid.</i>). Apollonius of Tyana (<i>ibid.</i> LIII. § 1). Moderatus (<i>ibid.</i>). Erotianus. Demetrius (<i>ibid.</i>). Isæus the rhetorician (XLII. § 2, LII. § 1). Epictetus (L. § 5). Onosander (LVI. § 4). Pamphila.
40—70	
70—96	<i>The Flavian Family.</i> Josephus (LI. § 4). Archigenes. Soranus. Demonax (L. § 5). Scopelianus. Dion Chrysostomus (LII. § 2). <i>Nerva and Trajan.</i> Plutarchus (LIII. § 3, LV. § 1). Iamblichus the erotic writer (LIII. § 7). Aristeides Quintilianus. Aretæus (LVI. § 2). Theon of Smyrna.
96—117	
117—138	<i>Hadrian's reign.</i> Arrianus (LIV. § 2, LV. § 2). Favorinus (LII. § 4). Phlegon (LIV. § 4). Cephalion. Antonius Polemon. Numenius the rhetorician. Hadrianus and Paulus of Tyre (LII. § 6). Philo of Byblus (LV. § 6). Zenobius. Diogenianus.

A.D.	
117—138	Valerius Pollion. Justin Martyr (LVIII. § 2). Parthenius Phocæus. Ptolemæus Chennus. Apollonius Dyscolus (LII. § 8). Ælius Dionysius. Hermippus of Berytus. Taurus. CEnomaus (L. § 5). Secundus (<i>ibid.</i>). Ælius Harpocration. Ælian the tactician.
138—161	Ammianus and Philon, the epigrammatists. <i>Reign of Antoninus Pius.</i> Herodes Atticus (LII. § 3). Hephæstion (LII. § 8). Mæris (<i>ibid.</i>). Fronto (LIV. § 5). Pausanias the geographer (LV. § 7). Appian (LV. § 3). Marcellus Sidetes. Nicomachus of Gerasa.
161—180	<i>Reign of M. Aurelius.</i> M. Aurelius (LIV. § 2). Ælius Aristides (LII. § 5). Numenius and Cronius (LIII. § 4). Lucian (LIV. §§ 3, 4). Celsus. Herodian the grammarian (LII. § 8). Hermogenes (LII. § 6). Claudius Ptolemæus (LVI. § 1). Hypsicles. Galen (LVI. § 2). Aptonius of Antioch? Artemidorus Daldianus. Polyænus the Macedonian (LVI. § 4). Antoninus Liberalis. Agathemerus.
180—193	<i>Commodus. Pertinax. Didius Julianus.</i> Maximus Tyrius (LII. § 4). Phrynichus (LII. § 8). Julius Pollux (<i>ibid.</i>).
193—222	<i>Severus to Elagabalus.</i> Sextus Empiricus (LVI. § 3). Diogenes of Laërte ? (<i>ibid.</i>).

A. D.	
193—222	Clemens Alexandrinus (LVIII. § 3). Alexander Aphrodisiensis. Oppian. Philostratus the elder (LII. § 7). Athenæus (LVI. § 7). Ælian of Præneste (<i>ib.</i> § 6). Antonius Diogenes ? (LIX. § 4). Aspasius of Ravenna (LII. § 7). Ammonius Saccas of Alexandria (LIII. § 5). Dion Cassius (LV. § 4).
222—285	Sextus Julius Africanus (LVI. § 5). <i>Alexander Severus to Numerian.</i> Herodian the historian (LV. § 5). Plotinus (LIII. § 6). Origenes Adamantius (LVIII. § 3). Hippolytus (<i>ibid.</i>). Herennius (LIII. § 6). Philostratus the younger (LII. § 7). Origenes the Neo-Platonist (LIII. § 7). Longinus (LIV. §§ 5, 6). Apsines. Porphyrius (LIII. § 7). Menander of Laodicea. Gentilianus Amelius (LIII. § 7). Timæus the Sophist (LII. § 8).
285—306	<i>Diocletian to Constantius I.</i> Iamblichus of Chalcis (LIII. § 7). Helladius. Dionysius Periegetes. Ulpian of Antioch (LVII. § 2).
306—334	<i>Reign of Constantine I.</i> Eusebius (LVIII. § 4). Metrodorus.
337—364	Praxagoras (LX. § 8). <i>Constantine II. to Jovian.</i> Libanius (LVII. § 4). Prohæresius (LVIII. § 5). Himerius (LVII. § 5). Aristænetus and Alciphron ? (LIX. § 8). The Emperor Julian (LVII. § 6). Oribasius (LX. § 13). Gregory of Nazianzus (LVIII. § 6). Basil (<i>ib.</i> § 7). Gregory of Nyssa (<i>ib.</i>). Cæsarius (<i>ib.</i> § 6).

A.D.	
364—395	<i>Valentinian to Theodosius.</i> Themistius (LVII. § 3). Pappus (LIX. § 2). Diophantus (<i>ib.</i>). Heliodorus the Erotic Writer (<i>ib.</i> § 4). Theon of Alexandria (<i>ib.</i> § 2). Syrianus of Gaza (LVII. § 7).
395—476	<i>Division of the Empire to the end of the Western Empire.</i> Nemesius (LVIII. § 9). Synesius (<i>ibid.</i>). Cyril of Alexandria (<i>ib.</i> § 10). Proclus. (LVII. § 7). Eunapius (LX § 8). Olympiodorus (LVII. § 7). Zosimus. George Chæroboscus (LX. § 5). John Chrysostom (LVIII. § 8). Theodoret (LX. § 12). Cosmas Indicopleustes (LIX. § 3). Hermias (LVII. § 7). Orus (LX. § 4). Orion (<i>ibid.</i>). Stephanus of Byzantium ? Hierocles (LVII. § 7). Marinus (<i>ibid.</i>). Achilles Tatius ? (LIX. § 5). Longus ? (<i>ib.</i> 6). Musæus (<i>ib.</i> § 12). Socrates (LX. § 12). Sozomen (<i>ibid.</i>).
476—527 506	<i>Zeno, Anastasius, and Justin I.</i> <i>Masorah committed to writing.</i> Nonnus (LIX. § 9). Quintus Smyrnæus (<i>ib.</i> § 10). Coluthus and Tryphiodorus (<i>ib.</i> § 11). Ammonius and Heliodorus (LVII. § 7). Stobæus ? (LX. § 2). Priscus and Malchus (<i>ibid.</i> § 8). Procopius (<i>ibid.</i>). Zosimus (<i>ibid.</i>). Simplicius (LVII. § 7). Marianus (<i>ibid.</i>). Damascius (<i>ibid.</i>). Isidorus (<i>ibid.</i>).

A.D.	
506	Laurentius Lydus (LX. § 11).
527—580	<i>Justinian I. to Tiberius II.</i> Petrus Magister (LX. § 1). Joannes Philoponus (<i>ibid.</i>). Emathius? (LIX. § 7). Agathias (LX. § 7). Hesychius Illustrius (<i>ibid.</i> § 11). Nonnosus (<i>ibid.</i> § 1). Paulus Silentarius (<i>ibid.</i> § 7). John of Gaza. Alexander of Tralles (LX. § 13). Euagrius.
580—640	<i>Accession of Maurice, to the taking of Alexandria by the Saracens.</i> Menander Protector (LX. § 10). Theophylactus Simocatta (<i>ibid.</i> § 6). George the Pisidian (<i>ibid.</i> § 7). Theophilus Protospatharius (<i>ibid.</i> § 13). Palladius. Paulus Ægineta (LX. § 13).
718—741	<i>Leo the Isaurian.</i>
786—808	John of Damascus. <i>Haroun Alraschid.</i>
800	Georgius Syncellus (XLVI. § 4, LX. § 9). Nicephorus the patriarch (LX. § 9). Theophanes the Isaurian (<i>ibid.</i>)
829—842	<i>Theophilus.</i> Theodorus Studites (LX. § 1). Theophanes Confessor (<i>ibid.</i>) Johannes Grammaticus.
860	Leo the philosopher (LX. § 1). Photius (<i>ibid.</i> § 3). Michael Psellus the elder (<i>ibid.</i> § 10).
867—886	<i>Basilus I., the Macedonian.</i>
886—911	<i>Leo the Wise.</i> John Malelas? (LX. § 9).
911—959	<i>Constantine VII. Porphyrogenitus.</i> Simeon Logothetes. Genesisius. Leo Grammaticus (LX. § 9). Georgius Monachus (<i>ibid.</i>). Theophanes Nonnus (LX. § 1). Constantine Cephalas (LX. § 7). Cassianus Bassus.
963—969	<i>Nicephorus Phocas.</i>

A.D.	
963—969	Theodosius the Poet.
976—1025	<i>Basilius II.</i> Leo Diaconus. Simon Seth. Georgius Cedrenus (LX. § 9). Chronicon Paschale (<i>ibid.</i>). Joannes Xiphilinus (LV. § 4. LX. § 11). Suidas (LX. § 4). Etymologicum Magnum (<i>ibid.</i>). Constantine IX. Ducas. Eudocia. Theophylactus the Archbishop.
1059—1067	<i>Alexius I. Comnenus.</i>
1081—1118	Anna Commena (LX. § 10). Nicephorus Bryennius (<i>ibid.</i>). Joannes Scylitzes (<i>ibid.</i> § 9). Joannes Zonaras (<i>ibid.</i> § 8). Michael Psellus the younger (<i>ibid.</i> § 13). <i>Michael Comnenus.</i>
1143—1180	Theodorus Prodrumus (LX. § 6). Constantine Manasses (<i>ibid.</i> § 7). Isaac and John Tzetzes (<i>ibid.</i> §§ 5, 7). John Cinnamus (<i>ibid.</i> § 10). <i>Andronicus I. Comnenus.</i>
1183	Eustathius (LX. § 5). Michael Glycas (<i>ibid.</i> § 9). Gregory of Corinth (<i>ibid.</i> § 1). Emathius or Eustathius the erotic writer ? (LIX. § 7).
1204—1261	<i>The Latin Emperors.</i> Nicetas Acominatus (LX. § 8). Georgius Acropolites.
1250	<i>Michael Palæologus.</i>
1261—1282	Nicephorus Blemmydes (LX. § 1). Gregory [George] of Cyprus. Nicephorus Chumnus. Theodorus Hyrtacenus (LX. § 5). <i>Andronicus I.</i>
1283—1332	Georgius Pachymeres (LX. § 10). Thomas Magister (<i>ibid.</i> § 4). Theodorus Metochites. Manuel Philes (LX. § 7).
1330	Manuel Holobolus (<i>ibid.</i>). Maximus Planudes (<i>ibid.</i>). John Pediasimus (<i>ibid.</i>). Manuel Bryennius.

A.D.	
1344—1355	<i>Johannes Cantacuzenus.</i> Demetrius of Cydon (<i>ibid.</i> § 6). Nicephorus Gregoras (LX. § 8). Georgius Lecapenus (<i>ibid.</i> § 4). Constantine Harmenopolus.
1373—1425	<i>Manuel Palæologus.</i>
1397	Manuel Chrysoloras (LX. § 1). Manuel Moschopulus (<i>ibid.</i>). Demetrius Triclinius (<i>ibid.</i> § 5).
1440	Theodorus Gaza (<i>ibid.</i> § 1). Gemistus Pletho (<i>ibid.</i>). Bessarion (<i>ibid.</i>).
1453	Georgius Trapezuntius (<i>ibid.</i>). <i>Taking of Constantinople.</i> Michael Ducas (LX. § 10). Georgius Phrantzes (<i>ibid.</i>). Georgius Codinus (<i>ibid.</i> § 11). Laonicus Chalcondyles (<i>ibid.</i> § 8). Joannes Argyropulus. Michael Apostolius. Andronicus Callistus. Constantine and John Lascaris (<i>ibid.</i> § 1). Demetrius Chalcondyles Musurus (LX. § 1).

ADDITIONAL NOTES

TO THE

FIRST VOLUME OF MÜLLER'S LITERATURE OF GREECE.



BY DR. DONALDSON.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

TO THE FIRST VOLUME.

PAGE 1.

THE burning of the library of Alexandria by Omar is discredited by Gibbon (VI. pp. 336 sqq.), and we have adopted his view (vol. III. p. 373). But the old story is still maintained by scholars; see Milman's and W. Smith's *Notes on Gibbon*, vol. III. p. 417, and vol. VI. p. 338.

PAGES 3 sqq.

The relations of the Greeks to the other members of the Arian or Indo-Germanic family have been more fully discussed in the *New Cratylus*, book I. chapter IV.: 'the ethnographic affinities of the ancient Greeks;' and a somewhat similar view has been urged by Mr. Gladstone, in his *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*, Oxford, 1858, vol. I. § X. pp. 544 sqq.

PAGE 23.

On the *Hyporcheme*, see *Theatre of the Greeks*, 6th ed. pp. [18, 19], where we have cited the important passage from Athenæus, p. 630 D, in which the hyporchematic dance is said to have coincided in its peculiarities with the comic.

PAGE 33, NOTE *.

We do not think that the phrases φόρμιγγι καθαρίζειν and καθάρει φόρμιγγιν prove the identity of the phorminx and the cithara. The similarity of the instruments would be sufficient to account for the alternation. Although it seems that καθάρα, φόρμιγξ, and afterwards λύρα (not mentioned in the oldest poems attributed to Homer), are used indifferently to signify a stringed instrument, and though even Xenophon (*Sympos.* 3, § 1), and Aristotle (*Pol.* VII. 12), predicate καθαρίζειν of the λύρα, it is nearly certain that the three words originally and properly denoted three different kinds of harp or lute. The καθάρα, like our *guitar* (from the Italian *chitarra*), was strung upon a long neck, instead of having an open frame, like the φόρμιγξ and λύρα. It was the oldest, smallest, and least artificial of these instruments, and originally had only four strings. The φόρμιγξ, again, was the portable lyre, generally fastened by a strap to the shoulders of the performer (Hesych. ἡ τοῖς ὤμοις φερομένη), and the

word is specially used to denote the seven-stringed instrument invented by Terpander; see the passage quoted by Müller, p. 201, note 2, and compare Pindar, *Pyth.* II. 71: φόρμιγγος ἑπτακτύπου—*Nem.* V. 24: ἑπτάλωσσον φόρμιγγα. Finally, the λύρα (for κ-λύρα, root κλυ-, cf. κλυτα φόρμιγγι, Pind. *Isthm.* II. 2), was the largest, loudest, and most recently introduced of the three sorts of harp, and its hollow shell or body seems to have been too large to admit of its being held on the knee, which may have been its main distinction from the phorminx. It sometimes had nine strings (Athen. XIV. p. 636 B), and may even have borrowed the ten strings from the Semitic *kinûra* (Joseph. *Antiqu.* VII. 12, § 3).

PAGE 33.

On the wide extent of the functions of the rhapsodist, and the application of the verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι to his recitations, see *Theatre of the Greeks*, ed. 6, pp. [37—41].

PAGES 50 sqq.

Müller's distinction between the two parts of the *Iliad*, namely, an original part referring mainly to Achilles, and a superinduced part embracing the exploits of the other heroes and the general conduct of the war, has been enforced and extended by Mr. Grote in his *History of Greece*, vol. II. ch. XXI. He has shown that the *Iliad* was originally an *Achillêis*, built on a narrower plan, and then enlarged; that from the second book to the seventh Achilles is scarcely alluded to; that the Greeks not only do not miss his absence, but that Diomedes is exalted to a pitch of glory, in his contests with the gods, which Achilles never obtains, and is even placed above Achilles by the Trojan Helenus; consequently, that the primitive *Achillêis* included only Books I., VIII., XI.—XXII. Mr. Grote also inclines to the belief that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, though, perhaps, of the same age, were not, as Müller admits (p. 83), by the same author. These views are strongly combated by Mr. Gladstone, who, in his recent work on Homer, has taken a very enthusiastic view of the unity of the *Iliad*, and of the literary personality of the author of that poem and the *Odyssey*. The Homeric question has been fully and ably argued by Mr. Mure, in his elaborate *History of the Language and Literature of Greece*, London, 1850, vols. I., II. book II. chapters II.—XVIII. While we doubt whether the warmest admirers of Homer and Mr. Gladstone (and both the poet and his panegyrist are worthy of the greatest admiration,) will indorse all the Homerolatry of that eloquent and accomplished statesman, we are disposed to accept Mr. Grote's modification of the views of Müller.

PAGE 133, NOTE *.

The etymology of these words has been fully examined in the *New Cratylus*, §§ 317, 318.

PAGE 172.

The favourable opinion of Sappho's moral character, which is here expressed by Müller, has been generally received in Germany since 1816, when Welcker published his pamphlet entitled: *Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreit*, with reference to which Thirlwall says (*History of Greece*, II. p. 126), that the character of this poetess 'has been rescued, by one of the happiest efforts of modern criticism, from the unmerited reproach under which it had laboured for so many centuries.' A similar view is taken by Bernhardt (*Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, II. p. 488), and Bode (*Geschichte der griechischen Poesie*, II. pp. 423—425). But Mr. Mure has maintained the older view of the question (*Lit. of Greece*, vol. III. pp. 272 sqq.), and, by so doing, has given great offence to Welcker, who has attacked him (in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1856, pp. 226 sqq. 'Ueber die beiden Oden der Sappho'), with an *animus* which must have been prompted rather by wounded vanity than by zeal for the fair fame of a literary heroine of such antiquity. Mure has answered Welcker in the same periodical (*Rhein. Mus.* 1857, pp. 564 sqq. 'Sappho, and the Ideal Love of the Greeks'); and as this spirited reply, though written in English, is published only in a German journal, we shall venture to make a somewhat lengthened extract from it, in order that the readers of Müller may be able to compare his view with the opposite opinion, as expressed by one who has studied this painful subject with all the appliances of modern learning and with the practised judgment of an experienced man of the world.

'My unfavourable view of Sappho's relation to her own sex is founded; first, on the passages of her poems allusive to that relation; secondly, on the evidence at large which her remains supply, of her immoral habits; thirdly, in so far as secondary evidence is required, on that of those ancient commentators, Ovid in particular, who, in full possession of her works, and of all subsidiary aids to their interpretation, and free from the erotic hallucination of the second-rate Platonists of his age, was, by his peculiar order of taste and intellect, singularly qualified to judge in such matters; and whose judgment regarding Sappho's female as well as male loves coincides in all essential respects with my own.

'In my p. 317 I have, in concurrence with Longinus, described the passage most broadly descriptive of her affection for a female favourite, as the one 'which, in the whole volume of Greek erotic literature, offered the most powerful concentration, into one brilliant focus, of the various modes in which the overwhelming influence of amorous concupiscence can display itself on the human frame.' I have hence assumed that the affection experienced was not mere friendship, but irregular passion. The more reasonable of the 'apologists' do not deny that such would be the literal construction of her language; but they object to its being so construed. They argue that it does but reflect 'an essential feature of the Greek character,' the habit of 'mixing up feelings that among nations of calmer temperament have always been perfectly distinct.'* I deny that this is a feature of the Greek character. To assert that it is, is a pure *petitio principii*. It is not illustrating Sappho by laws founded on the Greek character, but forcing on the Greek character laws founded on fanciful interpretations of a

* [This is a reference to Müller I. p. 236.]

single poetess. I maintain that, far from mixing up feelings perfectly distinct, one of the most characteristic excellences of the Greek Muse is the unequivocal precision with which she discriminates every different passion or feeling; and which contrasts not more strongly with the wild allegory of the East, than with the dreamy sentimentality of much of our popular English and German poetry. In no Greek author, as Welcker himself (strange to say) has justly remarked (*Kl. S.* p. 83), was this excellence more conspicuous than in Sappho, or more generally recognised by her native critics; not one of whom would have dreamt of taking those passages in any other than a purely erotic sense: whatever view they might take of the erotic impulse which dictated them. Still more to the point than the commentary of Longinus is the anecdote in Plutarch (*Demetr.* 38), of the mode in which the physician Erasistratus applied the symptoms described in Ode II. as a practical love test, in the celebrated case of Antiochus and Stratonice. That Welcker should actually quote this anecdote (*Rh. M.* p. 229), in proof of the unsensual nature of the symptoms, is an obliquity of judgment against which it would be vain to argue. Suffice it to refer to the sequel of the story, where the possession of Stratonice's person by the lover, is found necessary to remove both the symptoms and the disease. We have here at least Plutarch's assurance, that what Sappho felt towards Atthis, was the same as a man feels towards a woman, whom he is burning with desire to enjoy.

'If all we knew besides of Sappho went to prove her a virtuous woman, there might be something in these attempts to mystify the natural sense of her language. But now that the leading champion of her honor has admitted, that at an age when the fire of sexual passion commonly begins to burn dim—when (as he so naively describes her, *Rh. M.* p. 246) 'a widow, mistress of a school,' and mother of a daughter, whom it was her duty to train, both by example and precept, in the path of virtue,—she threw herself into the arms of a paramour, young enough to have been her son; that when deserted by him, she pursued him frantically over the face of Hellas, and emblazoned her shame, for the benefit of her daughter, her scholars, and the Hellenic public, in an ode second in elegant lasciviousness to none in the literature of her country,—now that all this has been admitted by her own leading advocate, the case for the defence breaks down altogether. A woman who is proved in one instance to have acted in such a manner, and proclaimed her act in such a strain, is hardly entitled to have a figurative construction put on her other descriptions of her amorous emotions, to whomsoever addressed.

'The evidence of general character is here so important, that I shall pursue it a step or two further. From certain expressions in this ode I inferred (p. 309), that the male amour there described was not the only one in which Sappho had been engaged. As Welcker seems neither to have understood my inference, nor the passage on which it was founded, I must explain myself more clearly. Assuming, as he assumes, the love for Phaon to have been a single and a constant love, though chequered by lover's quarrels, how could Venus, described by the poetess as so much in her confidence and so deeply interested in her affairs, be ignorant of that fact; or how could Sappho in this ode attribute to her such ignorance, and represent her, when called in to aid on a former occasion, as anxiously inquiring (v. 18 sq.): 'Who is it that offends you? Whom shall I again allure back to your love?' Even supposing (with Welcker), that the occasion referred to was a previous quarrel with Phaon, these questions of the goddess would still imply, that he was not the first or only such enemy, against whom she had been invoked as an ally.

'My opponent and his fellow apologists everywhere assume that Sappho was married; on the ground chiefly that she had a daughter, and that the daughter of so exemplary a woman must necessarily have been a legitimate child. In my p. 278 I urged, though here again with too little precision, what I thought fair evidence to the contrary; and here again Welcker (p. 252), without answering my reasons simply pronounces them 'insignificant,' and continues his argument on the basis of Sappho having had a husband. Let us first see how he makes out his case, and I will then add a word or two on mine. He repudiates with commentators of all classes, the 'Cercolas of Andros,' who with the Attic comedians figured as Sappho's consort, as an indecent fiction of those satirists. He appeals however to the graver authority of Suidas, whom he quotes (*Kl. S.* p. 113) as stating: 'that she was

married to a rich citizen of Mytilene.' Suidas states no such thing. Let him speak for himself: ἐγαμήθη δὲ ἀνδρὶ Κερκώλῃ πλουσιωτάτῳ, ὁρμαιμένῳ ἀπὸ Ἀνδρου. The husband of Suidas therefore is the Cercolas of the comedy. The Mytilenæan marriage certificate is a fictitious document; and all evidence on the affirmative side disappears.*—The evidence on the negative side is: first, the absence from her remains of all mention of her married life. There is one quality for which Sappho's apologists and detractors equally give her credit, the openness of her nature, and the consequent number and frankness of her allusions to herself and her affairs. Assuming then the first half of her womanhood to have been passed with a husband, how is it, that amid those copious notices of other persons and things connected with her, not one should occur to the father of her child, to the joys or anxieties of her connubial life, to the sorrows of her widowhood? The evidence that her entire collection was barren of such notices is equally conclusive. There can be no doubt that Ovid's 'Letter to Phaon' mentions every more prominent fact of her life transmitted on her own authority; but not a hint of her married state. It seems incredible that a poet of Ovid's taste and discernment, in dwelling on so many details foreign to his argument; on the death of her parents in her sixth year; on her quarrel with her brother, its cause, and his subsequent destiny; on her daughter; on her female associates, their names, and the nature of her connexion with them,—should have omitted the part of her history best calculated to enhance the effect of his elegy, by pathetic apostrophes of the afflicted fair one, to her past days of peace in the enjoyment of an innocent love, or to her widowhood as the primary source of her present crime and sorrow. Add to this the indirect negative placed on her marriage by both Horace and Ovid, in their pointed mention of her as the 'Lesbian maiden.' Who can believe that Ovid, or any poet in his senses, would have made Phaon address a middle-aged widow by the title of 'Lesbi puella?' The case therefore reduces itself to the subjoined logical thesis: A certain lady had a daughter. It is admitted that this lady cohabited for some years with at least one youthful paramour. There is no evidence that she ever was married, but a good deal to the opposite effect. Whether is it more probable that the daughter was the offspring of the paramour, or of a husband? Of a husband maintains Welcker. The reader may form his own opinion.'

PAGE 199.

If the dithyrambic or cyclic chorus of fifty was represented by a quadrangular chorus of forty-eight, with two ἐξάρχοντες, in the improvements introduced by Stesichorus, the eight rows of six each would represent the element of subdivision, which furnished the choruses in the comedy and in the different plays of the tragic trilogy. For the chorus of comedy consisted of twenty-four, *i. e.* of four of the eight rows; the satyric chorus probably of six, *i. e.* of one row; and the three tragic choruses generally of two bands of fifteen each, and one of twelve, *i. e.* the latter being two rows, and the two former dividing five rows between them. We first stated this view in the article *Chorus*, in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, first edition, p. 226.

PAGE 203.

We have given, as we conceive, a more complete account of Arion's improvements and their consequences in the *Theatre of the Greeks*, ed. 6, pp. [28—31].

* Had Sappho had an authentically recorded husband, there would hardly, in the true spirit of the Attic comedy, have been room for a purely fictitious one of this description. The point of the jest evidently is, that she had no husband but κέρκος. The ambiguously figurative phrase: ὁρμαιμένος ἀπὸ Ἀνδρου (viriliter irrumpens) is probably borrowed to the letter from the comedy.

PAGE 217.

It seems to us that this fragment of Corinna can hardly be understood as implying that poetry was beyond the proper province of a woman. To say nothing of the celebrity of Sappho and Erinna, this would have been inconsistent with the professional position of Corinna herself. She must surely have said, in the passage from which these words were detached, that while she recognized the inequality of a woman like the shrill-toned Myrtis, and a man like the deep-voiced Pindar, she claimed for herself and the greater poetesses a full share of the inspiration, which Apollo might bestow on women as well as men. In rough English verse the context may have been to the following effect :—

I blame the shrill-toned Myrtis, I,
That she, a woman born,
Should enter into rivalry
With Pindar : but the scorn
Of man for woman is unjust ;
When Phœbus gives the skill
To mind of woman, woman must
Obey the prophet's will.

Perhaps Euripides had the whole passage before him when he wrote (*Med.* 424) :—

οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἀμετέρα γυνάμα λύρας
ᾤπασε θέσπιν ἀοιδᾶν
Φοῖβος, ἀγήτωρ μελέων· ἐπεὶ ἀντάχῃσ' ἐν ὕμνον
ἀρσένων γέννα.

PAGE 238, sqq.

The early Greek philosophers, especially Pythagoras, are most elaborately discussed in the second volume of Rôth's *Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie* (Mannheim, 1858), where their oriental affinities are strongly maintained.

PAGE 264.

It seems right that the student should be informed how he ought to pronounce the name of such a celebrated writer as HELLANICUS OF MYTILENE ; and yet there are serious differences on the subject. According to the common opinion the name is simply the adjective Ἑλληνικός, for Ἑλληνικός. But though the *Etym. M.* gives this explanation, it adds (p. 331, 17) that the word is formed by syncope from Ἑλλανόικος ; and this view is adopted by Lobeck (*ad Phryni-chem*, p. 670) and by Dindorf (*Steph. Thes.* s.v. p. 758). We are disposed to maintain the common opinion, that the name is merely the adjective Ἑλληνικός, the change of accent being explained not only by the Æolic practice, which does not allow any oxytone word except the disyllabic prepositions παρά, περί, ὑπό (*Apollon. Synt.* p. 309), but also by the universal practice of the Greeks in the case of proper names ; for though the adjective εὐπειθής is oxytone, Εὐπειθής

as the name of a man draws back the accent. The name 'Ελληνίς, or rather 'Ελληνίς, was borne by one of the Lesbian women whose ill-treatment caused the death of Paches (*Anthol. Pal.* I. p. 493), and therefore 'Ελλάνιος or 'Ελλάνικος might very well have been the name of a Lesbian man, who was some seventy years old at the time when this heroine performed her voyage to Athens.

PAGE 289.

On the origin of the Greek drama, we beg to refer to the combinations which we have proposed in the *Theatre of the Greeks*, ed. 6, Introduction, chapters I.—IV.

PAGE 338.

The political relations between Sophocles and Pericles, which perhaps led to the appointment of the former as the colleague of the latter in the Samian War, are discussed in the Introduction to our edition of the *Antigone*, § 2. And the poet's intimacy with Herodotus forms in part the subject of a paper which we contributed in 1843 to the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, vol. I. No. 15. We take the liberty of extracting the argument, by which, as we conceive, we have established the fact that Herodotus was acquainted with and imitated the language of Sophocles.

"The more we read Herodotus the more we must be convinced that he was a diligent student of the writings of Sophocles. He was a great traveller and observer, but he was, for those days a great reader also. He frequently refers to the writings of other poets, Pindar, Alcæus, &c. ; but the chief subject of his meditations must have been the profound and difficult poetry of that great Athenian. This may be inferred from the circumstance, that, while he quotes other writers by name, he introduces his imitations of whole passages of Sophocles without so much as alluding to the author. Some of these quotations are so minute and circumstantial that the hypothesis of accidental coincidence is altogether inadmissible.

"To begin with the least doubtful of these citations, we find that, in the *third* book of his history, which contains more references to Samos than any other, Herodotus introduces the story of Intaphernes, whose wife gives the following reason for preferring her brother to the other prisoners (III. 119): 'O king, I might get another husband, if I had good luck, and other children, if I were to lose these ; but as I have no longer any father or mother, I know no means of getting another brother.' Now in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, which was acted just before the tragedian went to Samos, where he probably met Herodotus, we find *Antigone* arguing in precisely the same manner. Since the whole argument is a conceit, it is much more reasonable to suppose that Herodotus introduced it into the speech which he *made* for the wife of Intaphernes, than that Sophocles borrowed it from a history, which, for all that we know, was not

published till many years after. Even supposing that Herodotus wrote his *third* book before the performance of the *Antigone*, and supposing that Sophocles was well acquainted with that portion of his history, how unlikely it is that he would recollect the terms and phrases of a prose narrative, and preserve in his iambic dialogue the sentences of a λέξις εἰρημένη! If, on the other hand, we adopt the more reasonable supposition that the third book of Herodotus was written subsequently to the performance of the *Antigone*, and that Herodotus was acquainted with that play, we shall at once understand how Herodotus converted into Ionic prose the lines which had made an indelible impression upon his memory, and how he was led by the parallelism of circumstances to commit one of the most excusable of plagiarisms. Scholars in general think that Sophocles borrowed from Herodotus; but one cannot understand how this could be, and Valckenaer, who first remarked the resemblance between the two passages, seems to have made it clear, by the comparison which he instituted, that Sophocles was the original author of the sentiment. If any competent scholar will place each line in the passage from the *Antigone* (v. 924), by the side of the corresponding clause in the narrative of Herodotus, he will find that the latter is a prosaic paraphrase of the former and nothing more:—

Sophocles. πόσις μὲν ἄν μοι, καθθανόντος, ἄλλος ᾗν.

Herodotus. ἀνὴρ μὲν μοι ἄν ἄλλος γένοιτο, εἰ δαίμων ἐθέλοι.

Sophocles. καὶ παῖς ἀπ' ἄλλου φωτὸς εἰ τοῦδ' ἤμπλακον.

Herodotus. καὶ τέκνα ἄλλα εἰ ταῦτ' ἀποβάλοιμι.

Sophocles. μητρὸς δ' ἐν' Αἰδου καὶ πατρὸς κεκευθότιν.

Herodotus. πατρὸς δὲ καὶ μητρὸς οὐκ ἔτι μεν ζώντων.

Sophocles. οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφὸς ὅστις ἄν βλάστοι πότε.

Herodotus. ἀδελφεὸς ἂν ἄλλος οὐδενὶ τρὸς πω γένοιτο.

“Surely no one can read this without being certain that Herodotus must have based this passage on a recollection of the lines of his friend Sophocles.

“But this is by no means the only passage in which Herodotus evinces a recollection of the writings of Sophocles. The celebrated saying of Solon (Herod. I. 32) must surely have been more familiar among his countrymen than with Herodotus. It is absurd to suppose that the dialogues and speeches in Herodotus have a real historical foundation. We can prove that some of these compositions are made up of γνώμαι borrowed from Greek poets. The speeches of the Persian conspirators, in book III. 80, sqq., in spite of the ἐλέχθησαν δ' ὧν of the author, must be regarded as pure fabrications; indeed they are thoroughly Greek throughout. Similarly, with regard to the saying of Solon, it is likely enough that Herodotus borrowed it from Sophocles (see *Æd. Tyr.* vv. 1528 sqq. and *Trach.* init. where it is called ‘an ancient saying.’)

“Again in III. 52, 53, among many other references to Greek poets, who lived long after Periander, there are four distinct imitations of the phraseology of Sophocles: (α) c. 52: κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο, ὃς

ἂν ἡ οἰκίῳσι ὑποδέξῃται μιν κ.τ.λ. cf. Soph. *Œd. T.* 238 : μήτ' εἰσδέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ. (b) c. 53 : βούλει τήν τε τυραννίδα ἐς ἄλλους πεσείν, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς διαφορηθέντα (cf. I. 88). Soph. *Aj.* 510 : εἰ νέας τροφῆς στερηθεῖς σοῦ διώσεται μόνος ὑπ' ὀρφανιστῶν μὴ φίλων. (d) *ibid.* : μὴ τῷ κακῷ τὸ κακὸν ἰῶ. Soph. *Alcædæ*, apud Stob. IV, 37 : ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τὰνθρώπων νοσεῖ, κακοῖς ὅταν θέλωσιν ἰᾶσθαι κακά.

"Another instance of a similar imitation of Sophocles is found in IV. 129 ; where the ὀρθὰ ἰστάντες τὰ ὄτα is supposed by Valckenaer and others to be a citation of the celebrated passage in Soph. *Electra*, 27 : ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν οὗς ἴστησιν κ.τ.λ. As in the passage last quoted, so in this, the historian seems to have had Pindar in his eye as well as Sophocles. Herodotus, in speaking of the braying of the asses, uses the singular phrase : ὑβρίζοντες ὧν οἱ ὄνοι ἐτάρασσον τὴν ἵππον τῶν Σκυθίων. That by ὑβρίζοντες he means the braying of the asses, is clear from what follows : μεταξὺ ὅκως ἀκούσειαν οἱ ἵπποι τῶν ὄνων τῆς φωνῆς ἐτάρασσοντο. Now Pindar, in his Tenth Pythian ode, which was written before the birth of Herodotus, speaks thus of the asses led to sacrifice by the Hyperboreans (V. 36) : Ἀπόλλων γελαῖ ὄρων ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, i.e., 'he laughs when he sees the loud-voiced wantonings of the asses.' If it is objected that ὄρων cannot refer to the sense of hearing, some might justify the confusion by quoting κτύπον δεδόρκα, &c. But it seems more probable that the poet refers generally to the spectacle of an ass in a state of ὕβρις, of which the most remarkable feature is his bray, and it must be owned that this is a sight ridiculous enough in the eyes of men and gods. Pindar, then, would mean by ὕβρις that the ass was in a state of clamorous and amorous excitement, implying by the epithet ὀρθίαν that he was braying—and Herodotus copying him, would take the more general word in the particular signification. This appears to be a proof that he was the copyist of Pindar and not the originator of this peculiar use of the verb ὑβρίζω. Similarly, one might infer that Hesiod's phrase ἐπέων νομός (*Op. et D.* 403) was borrowed from the longer and more elaborate parallel passage in Homer, *Il.* XX. 244, sqq."

INDEX.

- Abibalus, ii. 257
 Abron, i. 192, 195
Abstinence from flesh of animals, Porphyry on, ii. 200
 Abydenus, i. 330
 Academy, ii. 5, 37, 41
Achaica of Rhianus, i. 288
 Achilles Tatius, ii. 356
 Acilius Glabro, ii. 90
Acroamatic works of Aristotle, i. 117
 Acropolita, George, ii. 400
 Adeimantus, i. 45
Adoniazusae, i. 292
 Ælian, ii. 283
 Ælius Gallus, ii. 95
 Æneas, ii. 280
 Æschines, i. 157, 160, 162, 203; ii. 52; speeches against, i. 174; speeches of, i. 207
 Æschines of Miletus, ii. 54
 Æschylus of Cnidus, ii. 54
 Æsculapius, i. 241
Æthiopic Adventures, ii. 353
 Africanus, Sext. Jul. ii. 282
 Agathias, ii. 374
 Agis, i. 162
 Agnon, ii. 56
 Ἀῖρης, the, i. 294
 Αἴρια, the, i. 273
Ajax of Antisthenes, i. 14
Alcestis of Euripides, i. 250
 Alciphron, ii. 361
Alcmæon, i. 244
Al-magest, ii. 264
 Aldus, ii. 377
 Aleuads, i. 241
 Alexamenus, i. 57
 Alexander the Great, i. 107; 163, 198, 303; ii. 6, 48, 218
 Alexander the Ætolian, i. 259, 276
 Alexander of Tralles, ii. 374, 405
Alexandra, Lycophron's, i. 277
 Alexandria, poetic school of, i. 257; writers of, i. 307
 Amelius, ii. 197
 Ammonius, ii. 184, 311, 384
 Amphiaraus, i. 202
 Amyntas, i. 101, 129
Anabasis of Xenophon, i. 26, 29
Anabasis of Arrian, ii. 245
 Anagrams of Lycophron, i. 277
Analytics of Aristotle, i. 128
 Anaxarchus, ii. 14
 Anaximenes, i. 220, 319
 Andreopulus, Michael, ii. 98
 Andromachus, i. 246; ii. 60
 Andron, i. 229
 Andronicus, i. 148
 Androtion, i. 158, 170, 231
Anebo, epistle to, ii. 201; *reply to*, ii. 204
 Anna Commena, ii. 375, 399
 Anniceris, i. 22, 49
Anthologia Palatina, ii. 394
 Anthologies, ii. 93; Byzantine, ii. 393.
Anthology of Stobæus, ii. 379
 Anticleides, i. 319
 Antigonus, i. 233; Gonatas, ii. 23
 Antiochus, i. 223; ii. 40
 Antipater, i. 111, 163, 198; ii. 6, 9, 34, 94
 Antiphon, i. 240
 Antisthenes, i. 14
 Antonius, ii. 58; Diogenes, ii. 353
 Apellicon, i. 115
 Aphobus, i. 152
 Aphobetus, i. 204
Apion, treatise against, ii. 130
Apocrypha, i. 494; ii. 168
 Apollonides, ii. 105
 Apollonius Molon, ii. 98; Dyscolus, ii. 164; Rhodius, i. 274, 282, 305; ii. 52.
 Apollonius of Perga, i. 336, 344
 Apollonius of Tyana, ii. 108, 171
Apollonius, life of, ii. 161
Apollonius King of Tyre, history of, ii. 161
 Apollodorus, i. 180, 321, 323; ii. 98, 104, 110
Apology of Socrates, i. 31, 33
 ἀποτελεσματικά, i. 326
 Appian, ii. 247
 Aratus, i. 265; ii. 48, 67
 Arcesilaus, ii. 5, 22, 37, 41
 Archagathus, ii. 99
Archelaus of Antisthenes, i. 15
 Archias, i. 163, 198; ii. 94
 Archibius, i. 272
 Archidemus, ii. 34

- Archimedes, i. 336, 340, 342
 Archimenes, i. 224
 Archippe, i. 180
 Archonides, i. 224
 Archytas, i. 50, 55
 Areteus, ii. 270
 Arete, i. 19
Argonautica, i. 282, 285
 Aristæus, ii. 48
 Aristarchus, i. 259, 310, 352, 313
 Aristæas, i. 331
 Aristedes, ii. 153, 354
 Aristedes, *sacred discourses of*, ii. 155
 Aristenæus, ii. 361
 Aristippus, i. 18, 20
 Aristobulus, i. 319; ii. 172
 Aristocles, ii. 52
 Aristocrates, i. 159, 170, 173
 Aristogeiton, i. 174, 197
 Ariston, i. 46; ii. 13, 34, 51
 Aristonicus, i. 163, 198
 Aristophon, i. 189, 205
 Aristophanes, i. 44, 46
 Aristophanes of Byzantium, i. 259, 311, 315
 Aristotle, i. 10, 20, 100, 110, 113, 117, 223; ii. 9, 36, 56
 Aristoxenus, ii. 11
 Aristyllus, i. 44, 336
 Arrian, i. 41; ii. 207, 244
 Arsinoë, i. 41, 347
 Artamenes, ii. 52
 Artemidorus, i. 246, 292
 Artemisia, i. 218
 Artemon, i. 148
 Asclepeia, i. 243
 Asiatic orators, ii. 54
 Asinius Trallianus, i. 234; Pollio, ii. 92
Aspasia of Antisthenes, i. 15
Ἀσπρια, i. 267
Ἀστρολογία, i. 267
Astrology, *on*, by Lucian? ii. 221
Astronomy, *the great construction of*, by Ptolemy, ii. 264
 Athanis, i. 227
 Athenæum, ii. 144
 Athenæus, i. 115; ii. 284
 Athenodorus, ii. 24, 56
 Athens, alliance with Thebes, i. 161
 Atrometos, i. 203
 Attalus, ii. 48
Atthis, i. 171, 229
 Atticus, ii. 92
 Attius, ii. 90
Auction of lives, ii. 227
 Aufidius, Cn., ii. 91
 Augustus, ii. 92
 Avienus, i. 267
Babylonian Adventures, ii. 354
Babyloniaca, ii. 202
 Baccheius, i. 412
 Bacchus, worship of, i. 146
Banquet of Xenophon, i. 37
 Basil, ii. 339
 Battiadæ, i. 269
 Berosus, i. 329
 Bessarion, John, ii. 377
Bibliotheca of Apollodorus, i. 321; of Diodorus, ii. 117
Biographies of Plutarch, ii. 238
 Bion, i. 300
 Bittis, i. 263
 Blæsus, i. 302
 Blemmidas, ii. 376
 Blossius, ii. 91
 Bokrât, i. 245
 Bucolic poets, i. 289
 Butadæ, i. 191
 Byzantine Literature, ii. 372
 Byzantium, siege of, i. 161
 Cæcilius of Calacte, ii. 55, 99, 234
 Cæsarius, ii. 338
 Calauria, i. 164
 Callicrates, ii. 48, 72
 Callinachus, i. 259, 269; works of, i. 271, 315, 323, 346, 347
 Callippus, i. 352
 Callistratus, i. 314
 Callisthenes, i. 109, 111, 154, 319
Canonic of Epicurus, ii. 19
 Cantacuzenus, John VI., ii. 400
 Carneades, ii. 38, 42, 51
 Carystius, i. 305
Cassandra of Lycophron, i. 277
 Cassianus Bassus, ii. 404
 Castor, ii. 110
 Catapult, i. 341
Categories of Aristotle, i. 126
 Categories, ii. 59
 Cato, ii. 39
 Catullus, i. 270, 272
 Cedrenus, George, ii. 398
 Celer, P. Egnatius, ii. 107
 Censorinus, ii. 39
 Cephisodorus, i. 106
 Chabrias, i. 154, 159
 Chares, i. 319
Churidemus, ii. 221, 319, 333, 360
 Charmadas, ii. 56, 305
 Chersonesus, speech on the, i. 169
 Chæreus, ii. 70
 Cheroboscus, George, ii. 388
 Chæroneia, i. 157, 161, 197
 Chlæneas, ii. 48
Choice of Hercules, i. 33
 Choricus, ii. 389
 Cleitomachus, ii. 56
Chronicum Paschale, ii. 375, 397

- Chronographies, i. 350
Christians, against the, Porphyry's treatise, ii. 201
 Critolaus, ii. 56
 Chrysippus, i. 115; ii. 27, 38, 51
 Chrysostom, John, ii. 341; Dion, ii. 146
 Cicero, i. 203, 208, 213, 216, 222, 228, 266; ii. 92
 Cinædi, i. 303
 Cincius Alimentus, L. ii. 90
 Cinnamus, John, ii. 400
 Cineas, ii. 47
 Cithara, ii. 441
 Claudius Ptolemæus, i. 336, 352
 Cleanthes, ii. 26, 51
 Cleitomachus, ii. 39
 Cleidemus, i. 230
 Cleitarchus, i. 319
 Clement of Alexandria, ii. 318; works of, 321
 Cleobule, i. 152
 Cleomenes, i. 258
 Cleomedes, ii. 349
 Cleonymus, speech on the inheritance of, i. 190
 Cleochares, ii. 54
Clouds, analysis of, i. 407
Cnidian sentences, i. 244
 Codinus, George, ii. 402
 Coluthus, ii. 367
 Commeni, the, ii. 375
 Conchylus, i. 316
Conic Elements of Apollonius, i. 344
 Conon of Samos, i. 351
 Constantine Cephalas, ii. 375, 393; Manasses, ii. 393; Porphyrogenitus, ii. 374, 399, 401
 Corinna, ii. 445
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, ii. 352
 Crannon, battle of, i. 163, 198
 Crantor, ii. 6, 35
 Crates, i. 17, 310, 314; ii. 7, 23, 35, 51
 Cratylus, i. 46, 81
 Critias, i. 5, 45
Critias of Plato, i. 88
 Critolaus, ii. 13, 38, 51
 Cronius, ii. 183
Crown, speech on the, i. 174, 176, 205
Crown, the, ii. 93
 Ctesias, i. 40
 Ctesibius, i. 336
 Ctesiphon, i. 162, 176; *speech against*, i. 208
 Ctesippus, i. 159
Cydippe, i. 272
 Cynics, i. 14, 16; ii. 5
Cynic by Lucian, ii. 222
 Cynosarges, gymnasium of, i. 16
 Cyreniacs, i. 18; ii. 5
 Cyril, ii. 346
Cyropædia, i. 26, 33, 36
 Cyrus of Antisthenes, i. 15
 Damascius, ii. 311
 Damasistratus, i. 218
 Damis, ii. 38
 Dante, i. 138
 Daphnis, ii. 54
Data of Euclid, i. 339
Deipnosophists of Athenæus, ii. 285
 Deiotarus, ii. 110
 Demades, i. 209
 Demaratus, i. 113
 Demetrius Phalereus, i. 209, 258, 307; ii. 2, 9, 46, 51, 55, 98, 108.
 Demetrius Triclinius, ii. 376, 389
 Demetrius of Cydon, ii. 391
 Democedes, i. 242, 245
 Democharus, i. 152, 165
 Democritus, i. 239; ii. 5
 Democritean philosophy, school of, ii. 18
 Demon, i. 231
 Demonax, ii. 108
 Demosthenes, i. 152, 165
 Demosthenes, style compared with Plato, i. 97
De Officiis of Cicero, ii. 35
De Oratore, ii. 56
Description of the world by Dicæarchus, ii. 12
 Diagoras, i. 189
Diagramma Hipparchi, i. 352
Dialectics of Plato and Aristotle, i. 119
διαλέγεσθαι, i. 57
 Dicæarchus, ii. 11
 Didymus, ii. 211; ii. 105
 Dinocrates, i. 258
 Diodorus, i. 158, 171; ii. 115.
 Diodorus Cronus, i. 14
 Diodorus Siculus, i. 217, 223
 Diogenes the Cynic, i. 16, 134; the Babylonian, ii. 34, 38
 Diogenes Laertius, ii. 277
 Diogenes, *biographies* of, ii. 279
 Diogenes Antonius, ii. 353
 Dion, i. 49, 225; Chrysostom, ii. 146; Cassius, ii. 250
Dionysian Adventures by Nonnus, ii. 364
 Dionysius, i. 46, 183, 190, 202, 208 217, 223, 330; ii. 96, 354, 389
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, ii. 100, 121
 Dionysius of Magnesia, ii. 54
 Dionysius the tyrant, i. 49
 Diophanes, ii. 91
 Diophantus, ii. 350, 496
 Dioscorides, i. 246

- Διοσθήμια*, i. 266
 Dioxippus, i. 201
 Diphilus, i. 195
 Diyllus, i. 215
 Domitian, i. 267
 Draco, i. 46
Dream, Lucian's, ii. 223
 Dropides, i. 45
 Ducas, Michael, ii. 400
 Duris, i. 217, 319

Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, ii. 330
Ecclesiasticus, ii. 168
 Eclectics, i. 307 ; ii. 185, 271
 Eclogues, i. 290
 Ἐκδλή, i. 273
 Elatea, i. 197
 Eleatics, i. 70
Elements of Euclid, i. 337.
 Ellipse, i. 345
 Emathius, ii. 360
Embassy, Speech on the, i. 174, 181, 204, 207
 Empedocles, i. 55, 244
Empusa, i. 203
Enneads of Plotinus, ii. 195
 Ennius, ii. 90
 Ἐνοπτερον of Eudoxus, i. 266
Entelechy of Aristotle, i. 121
Ephesian Adventures, ii. 354
 Ephorus, i. 214
 Epicharmus, i. 57, 59
 Epictetus, ii. 106 ; *Lectures* of, ii. 208 ; *Manual* of, ii. 209
 Epicurus, ii. 5, 17
Epinomis, ii. 7
 Epiphanius, ii. 403
Epitomæ, i. 310
 Er, the Armenian, i. 99
 Eratosthenes, ii. 306, 309, 323, 336, 345, 350, 353
Erigone, ii. 306, 347, 350
 Erotianus, i. 246
Esoteric Works of Aristotle, i. 116
 Eteobutadæ, i. 204
Ethics of Aristotle, i. 134, 136 ; of the Stoics, ii. 31
Etymologicum Magnum, ii. 375, 387
 Eubulides, i. 13
 Eubulus, i. 106, 161, 182, 189, 205
 Euclid, i. 336
 Euclid of Megara, i. 12, 48
 Euctemon, i. 171
 Eudemus, i. 116
Eudemian Ethics, i. 116, 134, 138 ; ii. 9
 Eudoxus, i. 266
 Eudoxus of Cnidus, i. 335
 Euergetes, Ptolemy, i. 259
 Euergus, *Speech* against, i. 180

 Eumenes, i. 260 ; ii. 48
 Eunapius, ii. 394
Eunuch, ii. 229
 Euphrates, i. 270 ; ii. 106
 Euphorion, i. 288
 Euripides, i. 5
 Europa, i. 215
 Eurymedon, i. 112
 Eurytus, i. 50
 Eusebius, ii. 330, 334
 Eustathius, ii. 375, 389
 Euthycles, i. 159
 Euxenippus, *speech* of Hypereides for, i. 201
 Evagrius, ii. 404
 Evander, ii. 38
 Evemerus, i. 320
 Excestides, i. 45
Exoteric works of Aristotle, i. 116

 Fabius Pictor, ii. 90
 Favorinus, ii. 151
Fisherman, ii. 228
 Fronto, ii. 230
 Funeral oration, i. 170

Galatea, i. 274
 Galen, i. 246 ; ii. 271
 Gallienus, ii. 191
Gazetteer of Greece by Pausanias, ii. 259
 Gelasius, ii. 403
 Gemistus Pletho, *Geo.*, ii. 376
 Genesius, ii. 375, 399
 Gentilianus, ii. 197
 George of Cyprus, ii. 376, 390
 George, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 397
 George, the Monk, ii. 397
 George, the Pisidian, ii. 374, 393
 George, the Syncellus, i. 323 ; ii. 374, 397
 George of Trebizond, ii. 377
 Germanicus Cæsar, ii. 95
Girdles of Africanus, ii. 282
 Glaucippus, i. 196
 Glaucion, i. 45
 Glaucothæa, i. 204
 Glaucus, i. 47
Glaucus, i. 274.
 Glycas, ii. 398
 Glycera, ii. 3
 Gnathæna, ii. 3
 Gorgias, i. 14 ; ii. 98
Gorgias of Plato, i. 52, 131
 Gracchus, Tiberius, ii. 91
 Gracchus, Gaius, ii. 91
 Gregory of Nyssen, ii. 340 ; of Nazianzus, 336
 Gregory Pardus, ii. 375
Grotto of the Nymphs in Odyssey, ii. 201
Gryllus of Aristotle, i. 132
 Gylippus, i. 224

- Gylon, i. 152
 Gymnasium of Cynosarges, i. 16
 Hadrian, ii. 143
 Hadrian of Tyre, ii. 159
Halcyon, ii. 221
 Halonnesus, speech on the, i. 169
 Harpalus, i. 163, 198, 209, 228
 Harpocraton, i. 210
 Hasdrubal, ii. 39
 Hecataeus, i. 329
Hecale, i. 270
 Hegesias, i. 22; ii. 53
 Hegesinus, ii. 38
 Hegesippus, i. 188
Helen, on the abduction of, ii. 367
 Heliodorus, ii. 96, 311, 354
 Helladius, ii. 384
 Hellanicus, ii. 446
Hellenica of Xenophon, i. 24, 27
 Hephæstion, ii. 164
Heracleia, i. 328
 Heracleides, i. 51, 225, 237
 Heracleitan doctrine, i. 70
 Herennius, ii. 185
 Herillus, ii. 25
 Hermogenes, i. 47, 182; ii. 156
 Hermagoras, ii. 53
 Hermeas, ii. 6
 Hermes of Philetas, i. 264
 Hermes Trismegistus, ii. 186
Hermes, i. 306, 347, 350
 Hermesianax, i. 265
 Hermias, i. 106; ii. 311
 Hermocrates, i. 89, 224
Hermocrates of Plato, i. 88
 Hermogenes, i. 208; ii. 58
 Hero, i. 336
 Hero and Leander, story of, ii. 370
Heroics of Philostratus, ii. 162
 Herodian, ii. 253
 Herodianus, ii. 165
 Herodicus, i. 239, 245
 Herodes Atticus, ii. 148, 151
Herodotus, or *Action*, ii. 223
 Heron, i. 211
 Hesychius Illustrius, ii. 374, 401
 Hesychius of Alexandria, ii. 384
 Hesychius of Jerusalem, ii. 403
 Hesychius, *Lexicon* of, ii. 384
 Hetærae, ii. 3
 Hiero, i. 292
 Hiero of Xenophon, i. 38
 Hierocles, ii. 53, 311
 Hieronymus, i. 319
 Hieronymus Mercurialis, i. 247
 Hierophilus, i. 412
 Himeræus, i. 163, 198
 Himerius, ii. 298
 Hipparchus, i. 336, 351
Hippias, or the *Bath*, ii. 222
 Hippocleas, i. 241
 Hippocrates, i. 237; works of, i. 246
 Hippodamas, i. 141
 Hippolytus, ii. 322
Historical Library of Diodorus, ii. 117
 Homer, recension of, i. 317
 Homer, the *Sequel to*, ii. 365
 Hypatia, ii. 351
 Hyperbola, i. 345
 Hypereides, i. 160, 163, 196; speeches of, 198—213
 Hypsicles, i. 337
 Iamblichus, ii. 202, 354
Ibis of Callimachus, i. 274
 Idyls, i. 290
Images of Philostratus, ii. 161, 163, 222
Interpretation of Aristotle, i. 126
 Isæus, i. 155, 180, 213
 Isidorus, ii. 311
 Isocola, ii. 135, 141
 Isocrates, i. 45, 132; ii. 57
 Ister, i. 235, 320
Jewish Archæology of Josephus, ii. 125, 127
Jewish Wars, *History of*, ii. 126
 John of Damascus, ii. 374
 John of Epiphaneia, ii. 399
 Josephus, ii. 125
 Juba the Second, ii. 113
 Julia Domna, ii. 171
 Julia Mamaea, ii. 278
 Julian the Apostate, ii. 300
 Justin Martyr, ii. 317
 Καλοκάγαθοι, i. 4
 Κανών, ὁ, i. 257
 Καταστροφισμοί, i. 350
 Κράττης ἡθικά, ii. 24
 Lacydeum, ii. 38
 Lacydes, ii. 38
 Lamian war, i. 163
 Laonicus Chalcondyles, ii. 377
 Lascaris, John, ii. 377
 Laureat, Marcus Tullius, ii. 95
 Laurentius, Joannes, ii. 374, 400
Laws of Plato, i. 141
 Lecapenus, Georgius, ii. 376, 388
 Lentulus Gætulicus, Cn., ii. 95
 Leo, ii. 374
 Leo Diaconus, ii. 375, 399
 Leo the grammarian, ii. 397
 Leo the Isaurian, ii. 374
 Leocrates, i. 195
 Leonidas, i. 207; ii. 324
 Leonidas of Tarentum, i. 279, 299
 Leontion, ii. 3
 Leontius Pilatus, ii. 376
 Leophanes, i. 251

- Leosthenes, i. 163, 198
 Leptines, i. 159, 170
Lesbian Adventures, ii. 358
 Lesbonax, ii. 104
Leucippe and Cleitophon, Adventures of, ii. 356
Lexicon of Photius, ii. 382
Lexiphanes of Lucian, ii. 229
 Libanius, ii. 294, 296
Library of Photius, ii. 381
Libya, History of, by Aristippus, i. 20
Life according to Nature, by Zeno, ii. 24
Life of Greece by Dicæarchus, ii. 12
 Livius Andronicus, ii. 90
Logic of the Stoics, ii. 30
Logic of Aristotle, i. 126
 Lollius Bassus, ii. 95
 Longinus, i. 203; ii. 198, 230
Long-lived men, on, ii. 221
 Longus, ii. 357
Loves, ii. 222
 Lucian, ii. 215 sqq.
 Lucilius, ii. 39
Lucius, or the Ass, ii. 222
 Lucullus, ii. 94
 Lyceum, ii. 5
 Lyciscus, ii. 48
 Lycomedes, i. 192
 Lycon, ii. 13, 51
 Lycophron, i. 191, 195, 275
 Lycus, i. 275
 Lycortas, ii. 48, 70
 Lyeurgus, i. 188, 191; *Laws of*, i. 194, 201, 213
 Lydus, ii. 400
 Lysimachus, i. 107

 Machaon, i. 243
 Macrinia, ii. 339
 Mæris, Ælius, ii. 164
 Mærocles, i. 188
Magna Moralia of Aristotle, i. 134
 Malchus, ii. 198, 394
 Malelas, ii. 375, 397
 Manasses, Constantine, ii. 398
 Manetho, i. 249, 309, 326
 Manichæus, ii. 192
 Mantinæa, battle of, i. 205
 Manuel Chrysoloras, ii. 376
 Manuel Holobólus, ii. 393
 Manuel Phile, ii. 393
 Marcus Aurelius, ii. 143, 211
 Marianus, i. 272, 287
 Marinus, ii. 264, 311
 Marsyas, i. 109
 Masorethæ, i. 260
 Mathematicians, i. 335
 Maximus Planudes, ii. 98, 376, 383, 393

 Maximus of Tyre, ii. 152
Measurements of Mountains, ii. 12
 Megalagyrus, i. 61
 Megalopolis, speech for, i. 166
Megalotegnum, ii. 274
 Megarics, i. 5
 Megasthenes, i. 330
 Megatime, i. 270
 Melanthius, i. 195, 229
 Meleager, ii. 93
 Melesagoras, i. 229
 Melissus, i. 244
Memorabilia of Xenophon, i. 26, 31
 Menander, i. 330; ii. 10
 Menander of Constantinople, ii. 398
 Menander the Protector, ii. 374
 Menecles, ii. 53
 Menedemus, i. 276
 Menelaus, ii. 91
 Menesæchmus, i. 193
Menippus of Lucian, ii. 222
 Mentor, i. 106
Messenica of Rhianus, i. 288
 Metallus, i. 46
 Metaphrastes, ii. 398.
Metaphysics of Aristotle, i. 118, 122, 150
Methodica of Aristotle, i. 128
 Metrodorus, ii. 19, 57
 Midias, i. 158, 170, 172
Milesian adventures, ii. 354
 Minnermus, i. 263
Miramir, ii. 274
 Mnemon, i. 247
 Moderatus, ii. 108
 Molon, ii. 52
Moralia, Plutarch's, ii. 179
 Morges, i. 193
 Moschopuli, ii. 376
 Moschus, i. 300
 Musæus, ii. 369
 Museum, i. 258
 Musonius, ii. 106
 Musurus, ii. 377
 Myron, ii. 54
 Myrtis, ii. 446
Mysteries, on the, ii. 204

 Næarchus, ii. 246
 Nævius, ii. 89
 Naucrates, i. 213, 218, 222; ii. 57
 Nazianzen, Gregory, ii. 336
 Næaras, speech against, i. 173
 Nearchus, i. 319
 Nelters, i. 114
 Nemesius, ii. 344
 Neocles, ii. 17
 Neo-platonists, i. 307; ii. 172
Nero, ii. 160, 221
 Nestor, ii. 368
 Nicæa, council of, ii. 330

- Nicander, i. 289
 Nicarete, ii. 3
 Nicephorus Bryennius, i. 239
 Nicephorus of Constantinople, ii. 398
 Nicephorus Gregoras, ii. 395
 Nicephorus Xanthopulus, ii. 404
 Nicetas Acominatus, ii. 395
 Nicolas, ii. 114
 Nicomachus, i. 101, 113
 Nicostratus, speech against, i. 181
 Nonnus, ii. 363
 Nonnosus, ii. 374
 Numenius, ii. 182
 Nymphis, i. 319

Economics of Aristotle, i. 143
Economics of Xenophon, i. 37
 Olympias, i. 107, 111, 203
 Olympiodorus, ii. 311
 Olympius, ii. 190
Olynthiacs, i. 167
 Olynthus, i. 157
 Onesicratus, i. 319
 Onomacritus, i. 316
Onomusticon, ii. 164
 Onosander, ii. 280
 Orators, Alexandrian, canon of, i. 189
 Oratory, ii. 49
 Oratory, Asiatic school of, ii. 53
Organon of Aristotle, i. 125, 128
 Oribasius, ii. 405
 Oriental ideas of the Greeks, ii. 166
 Oropus, i. 201
 Orpheus of Croton, i. 316
 Orphic theogony, i. 152
 Origen, ii. 323
 Orion, ii. 384
 Ovid, i. 267, 272, 274, 277

 Pachymeres, ii. 376, 400
 Pacuvius, ii. 90
 Palæologi, ii. 376, 400
 Palladius, i. 246
 Panætius, ii. 34
Panathenæicus of Isocrates, i. 132
Panegyric on Agesilaus, i. 35
 Pappus, i. 336; ii. 350
 Parabola, i. 345
 Parmenides, i. 244
Parmenides of Plato, i. 13, 78
 Parthenius, ii. 354
 Pasicles, i. 180
 Paul of Ægina, ii. 374, 405
 Paul the Silentiary, ii. 374, 393
 Paul, Saint, i. 267
 Pausanias, ii. 259
 Peace, speech against, i. 168
 Pediasimus, John, ii. 393
 Pelopidæ, i. 276
Pentateuch, commentaries on, by Philo,
 ii. 174

 Perdiccas, i. 242
 Peregrinus Photus, ii. 219
 Peregrinus Proteus, ii. 108
 Pericles, i. 42
Periegesis of Pausanias, i. 229
 Peripatetics, ii. 5, 10
 Persæus, ii. 23
 Perseus, ii. 48
Persians of Æschylus, i. 267, 273
 Petrus Magister, ii. 374
 Phædrus, ii. 98
Phædrus of Plato, i. 10, 61, 83, 131,
 230, 239
 Phænarete, i. 237
Phenomena of Aretas, commentary on,
 i. 351, 354
Phænomena of Euclid, i. 339
 Phæstis, i. 101
Phalaris, *Epistles* of, ii. 159, 223, 225
 Phanocles, i. 265
 Phanodemus, i. 231
 Philadelphus, Ptolemy, i. 259
Philebus of Plato, i. 13, 15, 90, 94
 Philagrius, ii. 52
 Philetas, i. 262, 310
 Philinus, i. 252; ii. 70
 Philip of Macedon, i. 107, 156, 161;
 of Side, ii. 403; of Thessalonica,
 ii. 93
Philip, *Speech on the letter of*, i. 170
Philippics of Demosthenes, i. 159,
 166; of Theopompus, i. 221
 Philippus, ii. 48; of Opus, i. 65
 Philiscus, ii. 60
 Philistus, i. 222, 224, 226
 Philo, ii. 10, 40, 255
 Philochares, i. 204
 Philochorus, i. 232, 273, 323; ii. 2
 Philocrates, i. 157, 160, 175, 189, 197
 Philodemus, ii. 99, 105
 Philo-Judæus, ii. 173, 176
 Philolaus, i. 50
 Philologers, ii. 234
 Philonidas, ii. 23
 Philopemen, ii. 71
Philopatris, ii. 220
 Philoponus, Joannes, ii. 373
 Philostorgus, ii. 403
 Philostratus, ii. 159
 Phylacographers, i. 302
 Phlius, battle of, i. 205
 Phocian War, i. 157, 206
 Phocion, i. 157, 161
 Phormio, i. 180
 Photius, ii. 381
 Phranzes, George, ii. 400
 Phryne, i. 203
 Phrynicius, ii. 164
 Phylarchus, ii. 69
Physical works of Aristotle, i. 144
Physics of the Stoics, ii. 33

- Plato, i. 7, 32, 37, 42, 183, 197, 225, 245; ii. 6, 36; works of, i. 59; system of, i. 70; style of, i. 96
 Platonism, Jewish, ii. 169
 Plautus, ii. 90
 Plotinus, ii. 185, 187; *on the life of*, ii. 200
 Plutarch, i. 209, 214, 231; ii. 178; doctrines of, ii. 180; works of, ii. 237
 Podaleirius, i. 243
Poetics of Aristotle, i. 133
Polemics of Xenocrates, i. 115
 Polemon, i. 236; ii. 6, 23, 95
 Poliorcetes, i. 209; ii. 2
 Politian, i. 272
Politics of Aristotle, i. 139, 247; of Antisthenes, i. 15; of Plato, i. 13, 48, 75; of Zeno, ii. 24
 Pollux, Julius, ii. 164
 Polyænus, ii. 95, 281
 Polybius, i. 217; ii. 65, 71; works of, ii. 76; style of, ii. 81; characteristics of, ii. 84
 Polybus, i. 250
 Polycles, i. 180; ii. 10
 Polyæuctus, i. 173, 188, 201
 Pompeius Theophanes, ii. 111
 Poseidonius, ii. 35, 115
 Potamon, ii. 98, 104, 185
 Praxagoras, i. 234
 Priscus, ii. 394
 Procles, i. 113
 Proclus, ii. 308, 311
 Procopius, ii. 374, 389
 Prodicus, ii. 394
 Proheræsius, ii. 299, 335
 Propertius, i. 263
 Protagoras, of Plato, i. 67, 239
Protagony, i. 230
 Proxenus, i. 23, 102, 113, 210
 Psellus, Mich. Constantine, ii. 375, 399, 404
 Ptolemy, i. 219; ii. 266; Claudius, ii. 263; Soter, i. 258; ii. 479; Philadelphus, i. 115
 Pyrrhon, ii. 5, 14
Pyrrhonian sketches, ii. 276
 Pyrrhonians, doctrines of, ii. 15
 Pyrrhus, i. 303; ii. 47; *history of*, ii. 62
 Pythagoras, i. 335; *life of*, ii. 200; *on the sect of*, ii. 203
 Pythias, i. 266; of Marseilles, ii. 136
 Quintilian, i. 203, 208, 216; ii. 57, 59
 Quintus Sextius, ii. 107
 Republic of Plato, i. 52, 85, 141; on the arrangement of, by Demosthenes? i. 170
 Rhetoric, ii. 50, 55
Rhetoric of Aristotle, i. 128
Rhetoric to Alexander, by Anaximenes, i. 132
 Rhianus, i. 287
 Rhinthon, i. 302
 Rhodian Orators, i. 207; ii. 52
 Rhodians, speech on the freedom of, i. 167
 Rogatianus, ii. 191
Roman Archæology of Dionysius, ii. 121
Roman History of Appian ii. 248
 Rufus, ii. 101, 106.
 Samos, i. 207; siege of, i. 341
 Sanchoniathon, ii. 256
 Sanscrit Epos, i. 274
Satho of Antisthenes, i. 15
 Saturnian Metre, ii. 89
 Satyrus, i. 156
 Sceptics, ii. 5
 Scholia on Aristotle, i. 115
 Scipio Æmilianus, ii. 73
 Sciras, i. 302
 Scylax, ii. 96
 Scylitz, John, ii. 397
 Scymnus, ii. 96
 Secundus, ii. 108
 Seneca, i. 214
Septuagint, i. 259; translators of, i. 331
Σικελικά, ii. 64
 Sicilian school of Rhetoric, i. 222
 Silanus, Licinius, ii. 107
 Silleus, i. 282
 Silli, i. 303
 Simichidas, i. 291
 Simmias, i. 300
 Smyrnæus, Quintus, ii. 365
 Socrates, i. 1, 47; ii. 97; method of, i. 167, 183
 Socrates Scholasticus, ii. 403
 Socratic schools, ii. 5
 Solon, i. 141
 Sopater, i. 302
Sophistes of Plato, i. 13, 15, 48, 74,
Sophistical proofs of Aristotle, i. 128
 Sophists, lives of the, ii. 162, 278
 Sophocles, i. 5; ii. 10
 Sophron, i. 55
 Soranus, i. 251
Sorrow, treatise on by Crantor, ii. 7
 Sosilus, ii. 70
Σωράδεια δῶματα, i. 309
 Sotades, i. 303
Sothis of Manetho, i. 326
 Sotion, ii. 107
 Sozomen, ii. 403
 Speusippus, i. 49; 51; ii. 5
Σπῆσις, ii. 58
 Stephanus, speech against, i. 181
 Stephen of Alexandria, ii. 405

- Stilpo, i. 14
 Stobæus, ii. 379
 Stoics, ii. 21, 23, 29
 Strabo, i. 216, 223; ii. 131; *Geography* of, ii. 135, 137; *Historical Commentaries* of, ii. 134
Stratagems of Polyænus, ii. 281
 Straton, ii. 10, 13
 Suidas, i. 222, 226, 262, 269, 275; ii. 375; *Lexicon* of, ii. 385
Suit of the Vowels, ii. 229
 Sulla, i. 275; ii. 92
Summa of Thomas Aquinas, i. 135
Συναγωγή τεχνῶν of Aristotle, i. 128, 132
Symmoræ, i. 157, 230; speech on, i. 166
 Symposius, ii. 361
 Syncretism, ii. 185
 Synesius, ii. 344
Syntaxis, the four-booked, ii. 265
 Syntipas, ii. 98
Syrian Goddess, on the, ii. 223

 Tamynæ, battle of, i. 205
Teacher of Rhetoricians, by Lucian, ii. 229
Tegnum of Galen, ii. 274
 Telecles, ii. 38
 Terentius, i. 287; ii. 90
 Tetralogies of Thrasylus, i. 60
 Thales, i. 335
 Theætetus, i. 336; ii. 8
Theætetus of Plato, i. 48, 50, 72; ii. 42
 Theagenis, i. 294
 Thebes, destruction of, i. 161
 Themistius, ii. 291
 Themistogenes of Syracuse, i. 29
 Theocrines, i. 210
 Theocrines, speech against, i. 173
 Theocritus, i. 218, 260, 269, 291
Theodectea of Aristotle, i. 132
 Theodectus, i. 133
 Theodoretus, ii. 404
 Theodorus, i. 20, 22, 48, 303, 336; ii. 98, 104, 153
 Theodorus Anagnostes, ii. 404
 Theodorus Gaza, ii. 377
 Theodorus Hyrtacenus, ii. 376, 390
 Theodorus Prodromus, ii. 390
 Theodorus Studites, ii. 374
 Theodosius of Alexandria, ii. 389
 Theodosius Diaconus, ii. 375
 Theodosius the younger, ii. 402
 Theodotus, ii. 144
 Theon, i. 336; ii. 351
 Theophanes, ii. 374
 Theophanes the Isaurian, ii. 397
 Theophanes Nonnus, ii. 375
 Theophilus Protospatharius, ii. 374, 405
 Theophrastus, i. 109, 113, 209; ii. 5, 9, 51

 Theophylactus Simocatta, ii. 374, 389, 398
 Theopompus, i. 15, 213, 217
 Theopompus, works of, ii. 380
 Theoric fund, i. 182
 Theramenes, i. 5
 Therippides, i. 153
Thesmophoriázusæ of Aristophanes, i. 239
Thessalica, i. 288
 Thessalus, i. 247
 Thirty tyrants, i. 29
 Thomas Magister, ii. 376, 388
 Thrasyllochus, i. 158
 Thucydides, i. 5, 27, 183, 223, 227, 254
 Timæus, i. 55, 219, 236; ii. 54, 60
Timæus of Plato, i. 88, 93, 143
 Timagenes, ii. 112
 Timarchus, i. 161, 175, 207
 Timochares, i. 336, 351
 Timocharides, i. 303
 Timocrates, i. 158, 170; ii. 104
 Timon, i. 303; ii. 16, 41
Topics of Aristotle, i. 128
Τρικάρανος of Anaximenes, i. 220
τριπολιτικός, the, ii. 12
 Tromes, i. 203
Troy, the taking of, by Tryphiodorus, ii. 368
 Tryphiodorus, ii. 367
 Tyrannio, i. 115
 Tyrtamus, ii. 9
 Tzetzes, John, i. 267, 278; ii. 375, 389, 391

 Ulpian, ii. 290
Ulysses of Antisthenes, i. 14

 Valerius, i. 287
 Valerius Harpocration, ii. 383
 Vicramāditya, i. 260
Virtues and vices, tract on, i. 139
 Voltaire, ii. 215
Voyage round the Euxine, by Arrian, ii. 244

Wisdom of Solomon, ii. 168
 Xenarchus, i. 303
 Xenocles, ii. 54
 Xenocrates, i. 104, 106, 115; ii. 5, 23
 Xenon, ii. 73
 Xenophanes, i. 223
 Xenophon, i. 23; treatises of, i. 38; style of, i. 39
 Xenophon of Ephesus, ii. 354
 Xenophon of Syracuse, i. 29
 Xiphilinus, Joannes, ii. 375, 402

Φαινόμενα, the, of Aratus, i. 266
Φαρμακεντριά, the, i. 293

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Φυσικός, ὁ of Antisthenes, i. 15</p> <p>Χαρακτῆρες, the, ii. 10</p> <p>Ψυχῆς, περί, of Aristotle, i. 123, 143</p> <p>Zeno, i. 8, 17, 57, ii. 5, 22, 34</p> | <p>Zenobia, ii. 232</p> <p>Zenodotus, i. 259, 262, 264, 276, 309 ;
ii. 311</p> <p>Zonaras, John, ii. 395</p> <p>Zopyrus, ii. 57, 394</p> <p>Zopyrus of Heraclea, i. 316</p> |
|---|---|

THE END.

SCHEELE MEMORIAL LIBRARY



3 6655 00104607 6

DATE DUE

PA
3052 haldson, John William
.D67 A history of the liter-
vol.2 ncient Greece...

stacks

1974

DATE

ISSUED TO

PA
3052
.D67
vol.2

1974

